ORTHODOXY IN THE CIVIL COURTS.

Property of

Harold B. Milliken — 1944

Burwell

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/bwb_S0-BVE-051

ORTHODOXY

IN THE

CIVIL COURTS

OR, A HISTORY OF THE CASE,

"THE STATE OF INDIANA, ON RELATION OF GEORGE K. POYSER AND WILLIAM A. KING, PLAINTIFF, *versus* THE TRUSTEES OF THE SALEM CHURCH OF THE METHODIST SOCIETY OF THE HAW-PATCH CIRCUIT OF THE WESTERN DIVISION OF MICHIGAN, ALIAS THE TRUSTEES OF THE SALEM PROTESTANT METHODIST CHURCH, ALONZO T. POYSER, DAVID F. DAMY, JOHN HOSTETTER, JOHN HITE, AND ALVIN H. RAMSBY, DEFENDANTS,"

Which was Tried in the Noble County, Indiana, Circuit Court, June 19 to 21, 1883, and in which was involved the Orthodoxy of the Christian Church

Embracing a Verbatim Report of the Testimony Given in the Case

EDITED BY J. H. EDWARDS

To which is appended an Argument drawn from the Testimony in the Case

BY W. D. OWEN

CINCINNATI
STANDARD PUBLISHING COMPANY
1891

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1883, by
STANDARD PUBLISHING COMPANY,
In the office of the Librarian of Congress, at Washington, D. C.

PREFACE.

This book is dovoted to a very important subject in the religious world—nothing less than the historical disturbing element in Christendom —"orthodoxy." What is the true teaching of the Scriptures? or What is true orthodoxy, as it is related to human redemption and salvation? is the one question which has connected itself with all the controversies of Christendom.

The Christian Church (Disciples of Christ), which has, in this country, made itself so potently felt in the domain of religious thought in the last half-century, and which, in that time, has gathered together a membership which is to-day about 700,000, and is rapidly increasing, and which membership embraces men of the most brilliant minds, enlarged hearts, and profound scholarship—men who have filled all the responsible positions in society, from the executive, legislative, and judicial offices of the government downward; such men as President James A. Garfield, Judge Jere. Black, *et al.*—has been forced to come before the civil courts to repel the charge of non-orthodoxy. The interests of Bible Christianity were thought to be of sufficient importance to justify the employment of an official reporter, who should faithfully report this case, that the world might know what the result would be when the legal tests were applied to the questions which were thus involved. This book is the result of that precaution. It contains an introduction bearing upon the question of orthodoxy; a statement of the facts and incidents which led to this legal discussion of the question; the pleadings in the case, so far as they are necessary to understand the issue involved, written by the editor; a *verbatim* report of the testimony given (which occupied two whole days), reported by George A. Yopst; the finding of the court, etc.; to which is

appended an argument deduced from the evidence, and which would have been a part of the argument before the jury, if it had been permitted to go that far, by W. D. Owen, one of the attornies who had the special charge of this issue.

It is believed that true Bible orthodoxy will be materially helped by the publication of this book; and, if this should be realized, it then becomes a work of philanthropy, for whatever will assist men to place themselves in such relations as will secure to them the blessings of the Gospel of Christ, is a work of love to men. It is thus, as a work of philanthropy, as a means of bringing uncorrupt Bible Christianity to the attention of men, and as a persuading power to induce men to place themselves within the range of the Gospel promises that they may receive the Gospel blessings, that this book is committed to the public.

J. H. E.

LIGONIER, Ind., October, 1883.

OUR ORTHODOXY

IN THE

CIVIL COURTS.

CHAPTER I.

INTRODUCTION.

This book is unique for the reason that it presents certain great issues in a way never before recorded.

The various fields of literature are well occupied with works of greater or less merit; and new books are appearing like spears of grass in the spring-time for number, giving new discussions of old themes, and recording investigations upon the borders of the still unknown. A diminution of these may not to be looked for, since the literary ax and saw, pick and spade, drill and blast, shovel and dredge are being used with tireless industry to construct new highways for human thought which are to lead into the golden lands of undiscovered wisdom; and the rapid pen, the running writer, and the lightning press are all being used to bring the results of this labor to the knowledge of the great masses of men. The reason for this teeming flood of books, no doubt, is to be found in the fact that there is an insatiable maw of a hungering public to be filled.

Books are to be found in all the fields of human thought, in so far as they have been cultivated. Science and philosophy, history and romance, biography and fiction, pure reason and lofty poetry, religion and irreligion, etc., etc., and these have been called out under a variety of circumstances. These fields have been gone over again and again, in a thousand ways, and many kaleidoscopic combinations have been produced, both for the instruction and amusement of men, and it would seem that nothing new in the way of producing literature could arise; but among these vast productions and the variety of ways by which the field of literature has been

hitherto occupied, there has arisen a new way, unique in itself, at least so far as America is concerned, by which to present to thoughtful men the great question of religious orthodoxy. This book has been thus produced, and it is the outgrowth of one of those fortuitous events which arise in the history of men—no one planned it, no one intended it, and yet it came.

The political orator on the stump in this country delights to run his fingers over the musical strings of freedom, for he knows that it will find a warm response in the heart of the freedom-loving American who delights to boast of his country as being the home of liberty, both political and religious. This American is made to exult in the fact that "every man can worship God, or not, according to the dictates of his own conscience," the Constitution of his country determining this in that it provides that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." Thus it is proclaimed to the world that, in America at least, there can be no orthodox religion by virtue of legal enactments, laws passed under the forms of parliamentary authority; that is, there can be no church whose organization, doctrine, forms, rites, and ceremonies are made right, or orthodox, by parliamentry enactment. If there is to be an orthodox religion in this country, therefore, it must be so from other considerations than this.

Under the powerful influence of this freedom in religious thought, which finds its bulwark of strength thus wrought into the Constitution, there has grown up in America a very strong indifference to what is called orthodoxy, and a like disregard of what is styled heterodoxy, in some quarters. These terms have been bandied a good deal, yet they have been applied to things in an indiscriminate way, having no definite longitude and latitude, meaning in the mind and use of one man one thing, and in the mind and use of another something else. This state of affairs has been tersely stated by another in the following way: "Orthodoxy is my 'doxy,' and heterodoxy is your 'doxy.'" These terms, therefore, have been made to express the *mine* and *thine* in religion, to a very large extent. And while this is true, it has nevertheless been felt that there is something which ought to be recognized and regarded as orthodox, while its opposite should be deemed heterodox. The trouble has been all the time to find an authority with powers sufficent to define these conceptions with such precision and correctness as to definitely designate the one and the other so as to command the respect and acquiescence of all parties. None of the great religious bodies could assume to do this; for, when any one of them would set up its own peculiarities as the standard of orthodoxy, it was sure to be met with a rebellion on the part of all others, because their peculiarities are just as worthy of such designation, and each party would choose to stand by its own. From these causes, there is now no well-de-

fined idea of what orthodoxy and heterodoxy are, the whole thing being a kind of kaleidoscopic combination which takes form and color from the particular position from which it is viewed. All along the line of religious adherents, from the hyper-Calvinistic predestinarian, who believes that God from all eternity irrevocably decreed that a certain portion of angels and men should be ordained unto everlasting life, and the other portion to eternal death, and that these are so definitely fixed that they, neither one, can be increased or diminished, to the super-Universalist who safely ensconces all mankind within the battlements of eternal blessedness, there rings out this resonant word, "orthodox." But what it means in the mouth of the Calvinistic predestinarian, is not what it means in the mouth of the liberal Universalist, and so along the whole line.

Then what is true orthodoxy? This book, with the aid of those things which enter into the administration of civil law, would fain be serviceable in answering this question. One thing is true: the reader will find, as he passes through its pages, that the decisions neither of kings, nor popes, nor councils, nor any other human authority which has sought to establish *dogmata* for the Christian world, have been invoked. The influence which these have had, deleterious and disastrous, may be seen in the long line of events which have succeeded the culmination of the contentions of Alexander and Arius of Alexandria, in the decrees of the Council of Nice, in Bythinia, A. D. 325, until the present time. If history establishes a single thing, it is this: Religious orthodoxy can not be established by the decrees of kings, popes, synods, councils, or by any other human authority.

To set this truth more prominently before the mind of the reader, let him note the following facts: The Council of Nice was composed of complaining and angry bishops, bishops jealous of and bitter against one another, and whom it required all the skill and authority of Constantine to control; but the emperor did finally succeed in restoring them to some kind of temper, so that they set about devising an orthodox creed. Following is a summary of the creed that, under these circumstances, they devised and which was immediately, by all the imperial authority of Constantine, pushed to the front as the only standard of orthodox faith:

"We believe in one God, the Father Almighty, Maker of all things visible and invisible: and in one Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, the only begotten; begotten of the Father, that is, of the substance of the Father; God of God; Light of Light; true God of true God; begotten, not made; consubstantial with the Father, by whom all things were made—things in heaven and things on earth; who, for us men, and for our salvation, came down and was incarnate, and became man, suffered, and rose again the third day, and ascended into the heavens, and comes to judge the quick and the dead: and in the Holy Ghost. And the catholic and apostolic church doth anathematize those persons who say, that there was a time when the Son of God was not; that he was not before he was born; that he was made of nothing, or of another substance or being; or that he is created, or changeable, or convertible."

This creed was not only set up as the standard of orthodox faith at the time, but it was made, to a certain extent, the law of life and death; for Constantine issued an edict banishing Arius to Illyricum, ordering that his followers should be called Porphyrians, ordaining that the books written by them should be burnt, that there be no vestige of their doctrine left; and, to complete the climax, enjoining "that if any one shall be found to have concealed any writing composed by Arius, and shall not immediately bring it and consume it in the fire, death shall be his punishment; for as soon as he is taken in his crime, he shall suffer a capital punishment." Thus, steadied in its pose before the world by the strong arm of the imperial government, was this human standard of religious faith set up.

But what were the results which this step, headed by the Emperor Constantine, effected as related to orthodoxy? Another hand has very fittingly described these results:

"The Scriptures were now no longer the standard of Christian faith. What was orthodox, and what heterodox, was, henceforward, to be determined by the decisions of the fathers and councils; and religion propagated, not by the apostolic methods of persuasion, accompanied with the meekness and gentleness of Christ, but by imperial edicts and decrees; nor were gainsayers to be brought to conviction by the simple weapons of reason and Scriptures, but persecuted and destroyed. It can not surprise us, if, after this, we find a continual fluctuation of the public faith, just as the prevailing party obtained the imperial authority to support them; or that we should meet with little else in ecclesiastical history than violence and cruelties, committed by men who had fully departed from the simplicity of the Christian doctrine and profession—men enslaved to avarice and ambition, and carried away with views of temporal grandeur, high preferments and large revenues."—(*Jones' Church History*, p. 139.)

The decision of the Council of Nice, though it was the judgment of the bishops present against Arius and his doctrine expressed by the vote of a large majority of them, and though it was sustained by the edicts and decrees of Constantine, did not settle the controversy which had arisen between Alexander and Arius over the sonship of Christ. It is true that the doctrine of Arius had been condemned by a large majority, that he himself had been banished by the edict of the emperor, that his books were ordered to be burned, that his followers were compelled to assent to the Nicene confession of faith, and that death had been pronounced against all who should conceal his works—all this is true; but persecuting edicts, whether originating with kings, emperors, councils, or popes, can not be executed in the domain of human thought, and scarcely can they be made to restrain the tongue and lips. However, this trinity question was as effectually settled by this decree of the Council of Nice as it is possible to settle any like question by such means; for, it had all the authority of the council itself, it was backed by all the authority of the imperial government, and it had the confirmation of the bishop, or pope, of Rome. As

soon as the decrees and canons of the Council of Nice were written out they were sent to Sylvester, bishop of Rome, by whom, with the concurrence of the bishops in the thirteenth Council of Rome, they were confirmed in the following words:

"We confirm, with our mouth, that which has been decreed at Nice, a city of Bythinia, by the three hundred and eighteen holy bishops, for the good of the catholic and apostolic church, mother of the faithful. We anathematize all those who shall dare to contradict the decrees of the great and holy council, which was assembled at Nice, in the presence of that most pious and venerable prince, the Emperor Constantine."—(*Maimburg's History of Arianism*, Vol. I., p. 48.)

Thus was this dogma made orthodox by council, emperor, and pope, and yet but thirty years elapse before the shoe is on the other foot; for Constantius, son of Constantine, and the synods of Arles and Milan condemn Athanasius, the strongest supporter of Alexander in the Council of Nice and the representative of the Nicene dogma, and adopted the Arian decrees. So, in the short space of thirty years, such a change of opinion was wrought that what was declared orthodox by the Council of Nice in 325, was condemned as heterodox by the synod of Arles in 353, and by the synod of Milan in 355. What was pronounced heterdox at Nice was declared orthodox at Milan.

Now, from the historical point of view, who can tell whether Arianism is heterodox or orthodox? it having been declared both by like authorities, and having been crushed and sustained by like imperial powers. And thus—may it not be truthfully affirmed?—is the whole history of the orthodox controversies down through the ages, including the rise of all those so-called churches which have their organizations based upon the deductions and conclusions of human assemblies, councils, etc., ascertained, as were the decrees of the Council of Nice and of the synods of Arles and Milan, by a vote.

The impossibility of settling the question of orthodoxy by such means as those noted above, in the light of the historic attempts, is apparent, and there is an inconsistency that obtrudes itself along with the impossibility which it would seem ought to have deterred from the attempts, but it did not. Yet inconsistency does not belong alone to the ages past, by any means. If we disturb the curtains so as to get but a glimpse of things as they are being played on the present stage of action, the same thing will appear. Above the clashings of unreconciled and discordant factions and sects, if one will turn the attentive ear, two musical sounds—"evangelical" and "orthodox"—may be heard rising like the siren's song. To some extent, by their musical cadences, they overcome the discordant notes which are continually being injected into the song which Christendom sings before the world, but they will never cover up all the inconsistencies

which obtrude themselves from the popular notions of orthodoxy. By some kind of legerdemain, in which the secret manipulations are yet undiscovered, many of the great religious bodies have, tacitly at least, consented to treat one another as orthodox—upon what principle it is hard to tell, for there is scarcely a principle which has found its way into their various formulated creeds but that, in some particular, is contradicted by some member of this so-called orthodox fraternity. It can not be that they are orthodox upon a series of contradicted principles. It may be that the only basis of a true orthodoxy will be found in that position taken by the Christian Church, and which has been developed in the trial of which this book gives an account. But to the inconsistency of the popular, so-called, orthodoxy. In the practical application of this orthodoxy, which has so inexplicably made its appearance among religious denominations, there appears one of those ridiculous inconsistencies which have burdened the entire course of ecclesiastical history from the Council of Nice until now. It will appear from the following case, as an illustration: Not long since, Dr. W. H. Thomas, one of the Methodist Episcopal pastors of Chicago, a man noted for his ability and consistent Christian life, was arraigned before the authorities of that Church on a charge of heterodoxy. In the trial which succeeded, these authorities found the charge sustained, and because of this fact the relation which had been sustained between Dr. Thomas and the Methodist Episcopal Church was dissolved by authority of the Church. The whole Methodist fraternity united in proclaiming Dr. Thomas as heterodox, and hence unworthy of its communion. Now, in the course of events—and the contingency which I now mention is not at all improbable—Dr. Thomas may find it both agreeable and acceptable to connect himself with a Congregational church. Now, should he do this, because the Congregational Church is regarded by the Methodists as an orthodox Church, the Methodist Church fraternity would be under the necessity of hailing, and associating with, as orthodox, the same Dr. Thomas, unchanged in principle, whom they had driven from their communion as heterodox. And the same thing may be said of Dr. Swing and the Presbyterian Church. If the Methodists were not to thus receive Dr. Thomas, and the Presbyterians Dr. Swing, then, to be consistent, they must not stop until each one in the whole round of so called orthodox churches has been thus struck, for each one of them is liable to be placed in precisely the same circumstances. Let this proceed, and it is easy to be seen that there will be as many standards of orthodoxy in the end, and that is the real fact now, as there have been repudiations, and we come right back to the condition of affairs in which orthodoxy is the *mine* and heterodoxy is the *thine* in religion. This must ensue, or Christendom remain filled, as it is now under the *régime* of a tacitly-consenting ortho-

doxy, with the jargon of inconsistency. From all this it is evident that the question of orthodoxy can not be settled by this reciprocal acceptance of the several churches, the one of the other. If it is to be settled at all, it must be done by some other means and upon some other basis than this.

The etymology of the word "orthodox" will give some aid in determining the scope of its meaning, and assigning to it a definite longitude and latitude. This, as given by Webster, is as follows: "Gr. ὀρθόδοξος (*orthodoxos*), from ὀρθός (*orthos*), right, true, and δόξα (*doxa*), opinion, from δοκεῖν (*dokein*), to think." The word, therefore, means to think right, or to have a correct opinion, and this can never be determined with authority by any assembly of men, be they never so learned, and wise, and good; for the one who has the ability to think right, and therefore to obtain a correct opinion of any subject of disputation, may be, in the possibilities of human action, confronted with the whole herd of learned, and wise, and good men, and a majority vote in this case would make the wrong right, and the right wrong. In this case the lone man is right and the multitude wrong. Galileo *vs.* the priesthood of the Catholic Church, is a case in point. Galileo taught the stability of the sun and the earth's motion, contrary to the priestly conception of these things. For this he was summoned to Rome and compelled to make an abjuration of his teachings. "Clad in sackcloth and kneeling," he swore upon the Gospels never again to teach the earth's motion and the sun's stability; he declared his detestation of the proscribed opinions, and promised to perform the penance laid upon him. Then rising from the ground, he is said to have exclaimed in an undertone: "*E pur si muove*"—it does move for all that; and the universal teaching of science to-day shows that the lone Galileo was right, and the combined Roman priesthood was wrong.

From what has now been said it will appear that a vote, no difference how unanimous it may be, can not change the status of an opinion—can not make a right opinion wrong, or a wrong opinion right.

To secure a genuine orthodoxy in the religion of the Bible, there must be made a movement backward beyond the Council of Nice to the apostolic, and immediately subsequent, times when the Scriptures were allowed to set forth their own orthodoxy, their own principles of right and truth. The Scriptures are better able to set forth those facts and principles which are connected with the redemption and salvation of men than any other agency, especially such a one as fluctuates and is under so many caprices as the human judgment, because they have been set forth under a divine inspiration. "The Bible, the whole Bible, and nothing but the Bible," becomes, therefore, the only standard of Christian orthodoxy. Every statement of the Bible is an orthodox statement. This covers a wide field, for

the Bible makes statements upon many subjects. In interpreting these statements there may be a wide diversity of opinion, and it is to be looked for that there will be a want of unanimity among the readers and students of the Bible upon its entire range of teaching; and if this unanimity is to be insisted upon before there can be a recognized orthodoxy, then it may be safely affirmed that there never will be a perfect Bible orthodoxy among men. But this is not necessary, for the principle of orthodoxy is applied among men only for the purpose of determining the conditions of a partial or complete fellowship among them; and, to determine these conditions for a Bible fellowship, only those statements which the Scriptures make necessary to secure the salvation and redemption promised in the gospel ought to be taken. A little analytical work will enable any one to make the discovery that these statements naturally fall into line in two sections: 1. Those things which the Scriptures make necessary to take a man from the world into the Church of Christ, viz., *faith* in the great objects of Scripture belief, a *repentance*, or turning to a reformation of life, a *confession* of Christ before men, and a *baptism* into the trinity of adorable names, on a genuine conformity to which the scriptures promise a salvation from the sins that are past, and an introduction into the divine fellowship of the church. 2. Those things which the Scriptures make necessary, after a man is in the church, to keep him there as long as he shall live, viz., *prayer*, the holy *service of worship*, and the acts of a *fraternal, philanthropic and pious life* by which an exalted manhood will be reached, and an everlasting salvation secured. These, and these only, it is believed, ought to be insisted upon in determining the conditions of the fellowship which is to subsist between the disciples of Christ in the church—the things which the Scriptures make necessary to salvation as related to the remission of sins in this life, and the final great redemption in the life to come; under no circumstances ought these conditions be made to embrace the things which are the outcome of human cogitation and speculation, which form so large a part of that which is technically called "scholastic theology," for these things may not only be wrong, as indicated above, but their acceptance or rejection will in no way assure or jeopardize one's salvation or final condition. For instance: as referred to above, it has been taught that God, by His own sovereign decree, has predestinated some men and angels unto everlasting life, and foreordained the remainder unto everlasting death, and that the number of these angels and men is so certain and definite that it can not be either increased or diminished. Now, if this be true as related to individual men and angels, it makes no kind of difference whether it is accepted or rejected, because this acceptance or rejection can have nothing to do in the least in determining the final condition, for the reason that that condition has been unalterably fixed by the sovereign act

of God from all eternity, according to the dogma; and, if it should turn out that this dogma is true, there will, without doubt, be among that number of men foreordained unto everlasting life, and who because of that foreordination became the recipients of everlasting life, both those who accept it and those who reject it, thus showing that their everlasting life was in no way assured or jeopardized by their acceptance or rejection of this dogma. But it is not so with those things which the Scriptures make necessary unto salvation. For instance: The Saviour commands His disciples to make known the gospel to every creature, assuring them that those who believe it and are baptized *shall be saved*, but that those who believe it not *shall be damned*. (Mark xvi. 15, 16.) Thus the salvation of men is made contingent upon their acceptance or rejection of the gospel. Not so with the *dogmata* of scholastic theology, which involve the speculations concerning the trinity, the sovereign decree of God, hereditary total depravity, etc., etc. The Christian Church, the body of people whose orthodoxy was called in question in the trial rehearsed in this book, has never assigned these *dogmata* a higher place than that of speculation and opinion, and has insisted that they should never be made the *criteria* of orthodoxy, but that in regard to them there ought to be indulged the widest latitude. While the Church would be thus liberal in these matters of opinion, it permits no latitude in those things which the Scriptures make necessary to salvation; as to those things it has uncompromisingly insisted that all men shall accept them according to the Bible teaching. It has done this, not simply to build up an organization of men, but that the salvation of Christ shall be assured to men under the promises of the gospel; and they insist that the term "orthodox," used as a term to designate the conditions of fellowship among the disciples of Christ, should not be applied to any thing which the Scriptures do not make a condition in the salvation of men—their salvation from past and present sin, and their salvation from an everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord and the glory of His power; and hence, that no body of men is orthodox, in the Christian application of that term, which does not accept all these Scriptural conditions, no difference how tenaciously the dogmas of speculation, or even the revelations of Scripture upon other things, are held.

Now, to get before the minds of the people these Scriptural conditions, and thus to set forth the only reasonable orthodoxy, various means have been resorted to and used: the song faculty has been drawn upon, the sacred desk and public platform have been diligently used, the arena of belligerent polemics has been sought, the powerful agencies of the pen and press have been brought into requisition, etc., etc.; but until now the civil courts in this country have never been invoked to aid in determining

this difficult problem. This book elucidates this subject by giving those things which have been evolved under the judicial processes of a circuit court, and the sanctities of solemn oath. It is believed that these will give both weight to its predominant statements, and interest in its perusal. The reader is now commended to the perusal of the book itself, which has been produced in so remarkable a manner, and treats this difficult subject in so unique a way.

CHAPTER II.

THE FACTS AND INCIDENTS WHICH LED TO THE TRIAL.

"O, the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and the knowledge of God! How unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past tracing out!" The Most High reigns in the armies above, and giveth the kingdoms of men to whomsoever He will; even a sparrow falls not to the ground without His notice. Many historical events are wholly inexplicable except on the theory that "there's a divinity which shapes our ends, rough-hew them how we will." That the volition of men is a potential factor in the production of human results, must not be overlooked; but to eliminate the superintendency of the divine in the affairs of men, is to put the problem of human life forever beyond solution. In a thousand ways this divine superintendency may be seen, not simply in the assertion of the awful majesty of God in a brilliant display of His power, but in the almost imprecептible handling of what may appear to be the minor things of human life and activity, so as to bring about certain and definite results. Men, with the limited knowledge-power which they possess, can manipulate things so as to produce results previously determined upon: why not God, the all-wise and omnipotent One? The problem of human existence is too profound for finite thought and knowledge. It must, of necessity, be relegated to the infinite Mind, by which, notwithstanding the intricacies which are produced through the power of volition, the hight and purpose of its possibilities will be attained; and in the consummation of these may be observed, probably, the most consummate Divine wisdom. At least, the drama of human life, from the time that Adam bathed himself in the light of the cherubim's flaming sword, as he passed outward over the threshold of Eden, to the time when another angel, standing with his feet as pillars of fire on land and on sea, rainbow-crowned, suffusing earth and deep with the light of his countenance, with hand uplifted toward heaven, shall swear that time shall be no more, is never left for one moment to the haphazard of chance in the production of effects. A Mighty One is the Master of this stage; and He brings about its results, not by the exercise of irresistible power, but by the control of mind and volition according to their own laws of action. The grand effect will be but the result of the combination of the minor effects. In reaching the climax in

the drama of human life, which will be when the portals of an everlasting life are opened to men, the Great Master produces the minor effects necessary to the grand consummation by bringing this and that element together, securing this and that condition, and producing this and that combination; and all this, too, in strict harmony with the principle known as moral agency in men. Who will say that the bringing together of the elements as they were found, the securing of the conditions which prevailed, and the producing of the combinations which existed in that series of events which resulted in the issue narrated in this book, is not the outcome of that Divine superintendency which is recognized in the armies above and felt in the kingdoms of men? If this truly be the result of such superintendency, then, what might otherwise appear as a mere unimportant event—which would not be singled out from a hundred other passing events—may be big with outgrowing consequences, consequences which may ramify all the conditions and remodel the whole structure of the religious world. Now, as the following facts and events are narrated, let the reader note if the hand of the Lord is not in all this.

Ligonier is a sprightly rural town of two thousand five hundred inhabitants, situated in Noble County, Indiana. It contains about the usual number of churches found in towns of its size, and about the usual per cent. of religious people. Among the churches of the town is the Christian Church, which was organized April 26, 1863. During its existence it has wielded a leading influence in the community, being blessed with a good degree of success, having enrolled in its membership four hundred and forty-seven names, over two hundred of which still remain on its register. The following ministers have served the Church as its pastors: Charles Richmond, G. W. Chapman, W. B. Hendryx, N. J. Aylsworth, James Hadsell, J. E. Harris, F. A. Grant, R. S. Groves, John Hurd, O. Ebert, J. M. Monroe (two terms), and J. H. Edwards, who is its present pastor. The Church has also enjoyed the labors, on special occasions, of J. H. Jones, R. Faurot, Wm. M. Roe, John S. Sweeney, O. A. Burgess, L. L. Carpenter, Ira J. Chase, J. M. Van Horn, and others. Being filled with the spirit of these godly men, which is the reflex of that spirit which is received in drinking in the truth of God, the Church has striven to hold forth the word of life in its purity and power before the community in which it is; and not only so, but it has reached out to the regions beyond, doing successful missionary work at various points in adjacent communities, notably so at Shobe's school-house, and at Diamond Lake. Among other places thus occupied is Salem Chapel, in the Haw-Patch.

The Haw-Patch is a district of country lying north of Ligonier, and is noted as one of the most beautiful and fertile expansions of country in the State. Its entire range of prospect, embracing its diligently cultivated

fields, its substantial and elegant improvements, its flocks of improved and thoroughbred stock, etc., indicates the thrift and intelligence of its inhabitants. Perhaps there is no like district of country where all the natural elements conspire to produce a more prosperous and intelligent community; and certainly there is no rural district where there is more of that genteelness, both in the suavity of personal manners and the elegant appointments of the home, which marks good society, and more of that outreaching after intelligent culture which develops power, than is found here. The best literary productions of the age, both in the form of books and magazines, are found and used in these homes. Progress and prosperity seem to have fixed their abode here.

In every community there are centers of attraction at which the people gather for their public assemblies. To provide for this contingency of civilized society, Mr. Conrad Miller and his wife, as far back as May 23, 1836, deeded to trustees for a nominal sum ($1.00), a parcel of land to be used, as recited in the deed, for a "school-house site, meeting-house site for holding religious services, and for a grave-yard site." This place at once became the gathering-point for the various public meetings of the community. A school-house was built on the ground; and the Baptists, Presbyterians, Protestant and Episcopal Methodists, etc., used it for their religious gatherings. On June 14, 1849, the trustees, Messrs. Curl and Hostetter, deeded the land to the Protestant Methodist Conference, and the church in the community set about building, with the aid of the people, a meeting-house upon it. Having done this, they, with other religious denominations, especially the Presbyterians, used it for religious services. As the Protestant Methodists had succeeded in getting the start in the community, they built up a prosperous congregation, and seemed to have secured the permanent lead in the community as to its religious operations. In the mean time, however, some of the pastors of the Christian Church in Ligonier paid the community some desultory visits, preaching as occasion permitted; notable among these was W. B. Hendryx, who delivered some sermons which are not forgotten even to this day, and which secured a respectful hearing and commanded a favorable judgment from the community.

This state of affairs substantially continued until 1877–'8, when, the old house having served the purpose of religious services for a long time, and having fallen behind the onward progress and prosperity of the neighborhood as compared with the surrounding improvements, an agitation was begun which looked toward the tearing down of this house and the erection of a better, more elegant and commodious structure for this purpose—a building more in harmony with the thrifty surroundings.

At length a meeting of the members of the Protestant Methodist

Church was called, to make arrangements for this work. The leading members of the Church responded to the call, and were present at this meeting, including the pastor, and, as the writer is informed, the president of the conference, too. At this meeting arrangements were made for building the new house, by securing a complete board of trustees, selecting a building committee, and preparing subscription papers upon which to secure the building fund—these subscription papers being prepared and written by the pastor of the church, Mr. Paxton, and put into the hands of the building committee. The society not being able to build such a house as was desired, it was concluded to make the solicitation of funds general; and, to secure the help of the outside portion of the community, the following clause was inserted in the subscription papers, viz.: "And said house shall be free to all orthodox denominations when not in use by the said Protestant Methodist Church."

Among the active members and helpers of the Methodist Church at this time were Messrs. George K. Poyser and William A. King, both of whom were trustees, and both of whom were put on the building committee. Mr. Poyser was made the chairman of the committee, and both he and Mr. King were the most active members of the committee, securing on their papers $2,000 of the $2,300 of subscriptions obtained, and taking almost the entire responsibility of building—looking after material, contracting with the workmen, superintending the work, collecting the subscriptions, paying the bills, etc., etc. Their unselfish interest in the work was a matter of note on all hands.

Finally the building was completed, and the day of dedication was announced. The day arriving, there was a general gathering of the Methodist Church, with its officials, pastor, president of the conference, and others, together with the community in general, to dedicate the house to the service for which it was erected. There being a deficit in the funds, a subscription was taken up amounting to some $700 or $800—more than enough to cover all obligations of the committee, and to sufficiently furnish the house. Thereupon the building committee turned the house over to those having the dedicatory services in charge; and there, in the presence and with the full acquiescence of the church, its officers, pastor, and the president of the conference, they having full knowledge of all the circumstances and conditions, the house was accepted from the hands of the building committee, and dedicated to its sacred service. Of the whole amount of money used in the construction of the house, $1,400 was obtained from those not connected with the Methodist society.

The house, thus erected and dedicated, is a beautiful brick structure, of graceful proportions, symmetrical spire, and stained glass windows. On the inside it is neatly frescoed, handsomely seated, and otherwise elegantly furnished. Taking it all in all, it is model country church.

After the dedication, with the occupancy of this new and elegant temple of service, and the favorable surroundings then existing, the Methodist Church entered upon what it supposed was to be a period of unexampled prosperity in its history. Having the sympathy and confidence of the community, it ought to have realized its anticipations. But it often occurs that in seeming prosperity, disintegration does its most desperate and rapid work. It was so with this society. Not very long after the completion of the house, the conference sent to this church a man whose name was A——. Previous to his coming there had been no little dissatisfaction in the minds of many, though probably not very outspoken, as to the ability of the men sent by the conference to serve them. It was felt that for their community, and with their surroundings, such as have been described above, they ought to have men of good ability; but instead of that the conference had been sending them men, as it has been graphically stated, "who were just fresh from the pine woods of the North." The pertinency of this remark will be appreciated when it is known that this church, though in Indiana, is attached to a Michigan conference, which extends far to the North. But with the arrival of A—— a new element of discord began soon to show itself—that of the alleged immoral and licentious conduct of this man. So definitely were the affirmations made of him in this respect, that a citation was made, and he appeared before a tribunal which investigated them. The evidence given in the case was considered so strong that Messrs. King and Poyser, mentioned above, and many others, were thoroughly convinced of the truthfulness of the allegations. The outcome of it was that Mr. A—— ceased his ministrations for the church; but at the next session of it, he carried the matter before the conference. The result of this appeal was that the conference discredited the allegations; and it not only discredited the allegations, but made its action emphatic by electing the said A—— president. So thoroughly convinced were Messrs. King, Poyser, Herald, Davis, and others of the community, of the substantial truthfulness of the allegations, having been thoroughly conversant with the evidence in the case, that the action of the conference was received by them with the utmost disgust. From that time on they refused to have anything more to do in the affairs of the church, saying, that if that was the kind of religion the conference propose to maintain, they would have nothing to do with it in any respect; and thus they withdrew from its affiliation and support, both as to financial aid and active work.

Under a balk like this many men are inclined to abandon all interest in the great work of the gospel of Christ; for they reason that if it fails to make better men than this, it is incompetent to do the great work it proposes, not remembering that those men whom it fails to make better are

not really under its influence and power—it is only an empty profession of faith, or, if not an empty profession, it is a mistaken conception as to what the gospel is. But it was not so with these men; they cast about them for a more exemplary proclaimer of the gospel; and, in the mean time, having formed a favorable acquaintance with J. M. Monroe, then the pastor of the Christian Church in Ligonier, and realizing that they had done more for the success of the building in the way of assuring its erection than any others; and having acted in good faith in respect to the clause in the subscription papers, cited above, giving the free use of the house to all orthodox denominations; and, believing therefore that they had both a moral and a legal right to at least a partial possession and use of the house whose erection their own zeal and work had secured, they arranged with the said J. M. Monroe, pastor of the Christian Church in Ligonier, to conduct religious services in the house at three o'clock on Sunday afternoons, an hour which in no way interfered with the hours occupied by the Methodist Church in its services, but which afforded many in the community the privilege of worship which they would not have otherwise improved. These appointments he continued, on alternate Sunday afternoons, as long as he remained pastor of the church in Ligonier, with at least the tacit permission of all parties concerned. His pastorate closed January 1, 1882, and the present pastor (the writer) succeeded him in the following April. In the mean time the church enjoyed the ministrations of various visiting brethren at different times; and when it was thus blessed these brethren visited Salem Chapel also, and thus the appointments were kept up through the interval. This continued until the pulpit was regularly filled as noted above; the appointments were resumed on every alternate Sunday afternoon, at three o'clock, under arrangements made between the officers of the Christian Church and the parties at whose suggestion and invitation the services were at first begun.

From this resumption the services were well attended, and with the exception of two or three appointments in midsummer, during which the Indiana Christian Sunday-school Association, and other organizations, were in encampment at Island Park, near by, these services improved both in attendance and interest; and, as it has been reported, the Methodist services, though continued every Sunday, both morning and evening, were on the decline in both these respects. Under these circumstances it would not be unreasonable to expect that a little feeling of chagrin, if not also of jealousy, should manifest itself; and so it did. This spirit at last began to clothe itself in such verbal forms as, "They have no right to come into our territory;" "We don't propose to be undermined," etc.

In view of the fact that, under these pretexts—or, rather, from this kind of food—this spirit continued to grow until it became imperious, it is

but right that the reader should know something of the character of the preaching which gave occasion for these upheavals of dissatisfaction, that he may be able to judge whether this manifestation of spirit was attributable to the preaching, or was the result of some other cause. This can now be done only in an imperfect way. The best that can be done is to subjoin a list of subjects discoursed upon, together with the Scripture motto used in connection with each theme. At this point it will be helpful to add that the method of polemic discourse was entirely ignored in all these discourses, reliance being placed in the power of the truth of the gospel, when simply and tersely stated, to produce conviction in the minds of the hearers. This indicates the manner of discourse; the title of the theme discussed, together with the Scripture motto used, will indicate the main temper of the thought advanced. Following is the list of themes:

1. "Jesus Able to Save." Motto: Hebrews vii. 25.

"Wherefore also he is able to save to the uttermost them that draw near unto God through him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them."

2. "What Think Ye of Christ?" Motto: Matthew xxii. 41–43.

"Now while the Pharisees were gathered together Jesus asked them a question, saying, What think ye of Christ? whose son is he? They say unto him, The son of David. He saith unto them, How then doth David in the Spirit call him Lord?"

3. "God's Power unto Salvation." Motto: Romans i. 16.

"For I am not ashamed of the gospel; for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth; to the Jew first, and also to the Greek."

4. "Pure Religion." Motto: James i. 27.

"Pure religion and undefiled before our God and Father is this, to visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction, and to keep himself unspotted from the world."

5. "The Issues of Life." Motto: Proverbs iv. 23.

"Keep thy heart with all diligence; for out of it are the issues of life."

6. "Firmly and Rightly Planted." Motto: Ephesians v. 6.

"Let no man deceive you with empty words; for because of these things cometh the wrath of God upon the sons of disobedience."

7. "The True Leadership of Men." Motto: Isaiah lv. 4.

"Behold I have given him for a witness to the people, a leader and commander to the people."

8. "The Glory of the Church." Motto: Psalm lxxxvii. 3–6.

"Glorious things are spoken of thee, O city of God. I will make mention of Rahab and Babylon to them that know me: behold Philistia,

and Tyre, with Ethiopia; this man was born there. And of Zion it shall be said, This and that man was born in her: And the Highest himself shall establish her. The Lord shall count, when he writeth up the people, that this man was born there."

9. "The Authority of the Word of Jesus." Motto: Mark xiii. 31.

"Heaven and earth shall pass away: but my words shall not pass away."

10. "Debility and Accountability of Men." Motto: Romans xiv. 12.

"So then each one of us shall give account of himself to God."

11. "Authority of Jesus to Teach." Motto: Matthew vii. 28, 29.

"And it came to pass when Jesus had ended these sayings, the people were astonished at his doctrine: for he taught them as one having authority, and not as the scribes."

12. "Searching the Scriptures." Motto: John v. 39.

"Ye search the Scriptures, because ye think that in them ye have eternal life: and these are they which bear witness of me."

13. "The New Creature." Motto: II. Corinthians v. 17.

"Wherefore if any man is in Christ, he is a new creature: the old things are passed away: behold, they are become new."

14. "The Manliness of Christ." Motto: II. Peter i. 3.

"Seeing that his divine power hath granted unto us all things that pertain unto life and godliness, through the knowledge of him that calls us by his own glory and virtue."

15. "Perfection." Motto: Matthew v. 48.

"Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect."

16. "Perfection of Conscience." Motto: Hebrews ix. 8–10.

"The Holy Spirit this signifying, that the way into the holy place hath not yet been made manifest, while as the first tabernacle is yet standing; which is a parable for the time now present; according to which are offered both gifts and sacrifices that can not, as touching the conscience, make the worshiper perfect, being only (with meats and drinks and divers washings) carnal ordinances, imposed until a time of reformation."

17. "The Beginning of Wisdom." Motto: Psalm cxi. 10.

"The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom: a good understanding have all they that do his commandments: his praise endureth forever."

18. "The Son Born, a Saviour." Motto: Luke ii. 10–14.

"And the angel said unto them, Be not afraid: for behold I bring you good tidings of great joy which shall be to all people: for there is born to you this day in the city of David a Saviour, which is Christ the Lord."

19. "Unity of Christ's Disciples." Motto: John xvii. 20, 21.

"Neither for these only do I pray, but for them also that believe on me through their word; that they may all be one; even as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be in us: that the world may believe that thou didst send me."*

This gives the whole line of subjects discussed from April, 1882, to January 7, 1883, and at which this people took alarm. Was the cause of alarm really in this, or was it in something else? Was it the hand of the Lord manipulating the elements so as to produce the conditions out of which should come an unique discussion of the question which has for so many centuries disturbed all Christendom, and thus more effectually open the way for that unity of the disciples of Christ, upon which the conversion of the world depends, as prayed for by the Saviour? If it can be said that "the wrath of men shall praise the Lord," may it not also come to pass that the jealousies of men may be, by the same hand, turned to a similar account? It looks that way.

After it was concluded by this people that the gospel preached was not the gospel that was desired by them, a difficulty came into view. It was no easy matter to break up these services, which had continued for from a year and a half to two years, with the tacit permission of all the interested parties, and, moreover, with the agreement which the church had entered into with the people, as set forth in their subscription paper, in the way, and at the same time lay any claim to the approval of the community. The first move to accomplish this end was a stratagem. Falling back upon their undisputed right to a priority in the use of the house, the quarterly conference, in session on January 6, 1883, determined to change the "plan of their appointments." Accordingly, on the following day, after the services were begun, a paper was brought to the pulpit with the request that it be read. At the proper time the request was complied with. The paper proved to be one prepared by the trustees of the house, and the pastor of the church, according to the decision of the conference, and was a notice to all parties associated together in keeping up those afternoon appointments, and especially to the pastor of the Christian Church, from the trustees, informing those parties that the conference had authorized the pastor of that church to hold four or more religious services on each Sunday (and that, too, on a $400 salary), giving the time for three of these services, one of which was to be at half past two o'clock P. M. (thus crowding upon the time of those obnoxious services), and authorizing the pastor to carry out the conference's "plan of appointments;" and also a notice from the pastor, Rev. B. Post, that he proposed to carry out his instructions. Taken by surprise—for not an inkling, not a whisper of

* It will be observed that the above mottoes from the New Testament are quoted from the Revised Version.

any contemplated movement of this kind had reached the ears of the offending minister before going to his appointment; not even the common courtesy of the men of the world, to say nothing of the obligations of Christian ethics, to seek a private consultation for the adjustment of matters, had been extended to him—there was no appointment left at this time for other meetings in the future.

The matter being taken under advisement and consultation for a day or two, it was determined to continue the appointments. So an answer was returned to the trustees and pastor of the church, accordingly, informing them that their right to the priority in the use of the house, and to arrange their "plan of appointments" as best suited themselves, and the convenience of their people, would be respected; but, also, feeling that the parties for whom the services were being held had a moral and Christian right, to say nothing of the legal right, to the use of the house, that appointments would be continued as usual, changing the time, however, from three o'clock P. M., to one o'clock, thus conforming to their regulated time (and such appointment was publicly made); and stating further that the appointments would be continued until a written notice from the trustees, signed by at least a majority of them, was received, forbidding the use of the house for those services, and that such notice only would be respected.

The effect of this answer was to drive them from the cover of their stratagem, and bring them to open work, where the full responsibility of their action would be assumed. Accordingly, before the time for the appointment announced had arrived, such notice was served, signed by all the trustees, forbidding the use of the house on all occasions, and for all purposes, funeral services alone excepted.

The door of that house, built by the people's money, obtained under a solemn contract, creaked the song of the exile as it turned upon its hinges, and thus shut out of a Christian church the simple gospel of Christ.

CHAPTER III.

TAKEN TO THE CIVIL COURT—THE PLEADINGS IN THE CASE.

Messrs. Geo. K. Poyser, William A. King, Henry Herald, and Owen Davis are not, and never have been, members of the Christian Church; they have been favorably impressed with its plain, simple and tangible presentation of the gospel of Christ, and they have listened to it with deep interest; but they have never identified themselves with it, further than it is indicated in their acts as set forth in the preceding and present chapters.

When the doors of Salem Chapel creaked on their hinges, and shut them and the obnoxious church out of its inclosure, then the doors of their hearts opened, and a solemn determination crossed the threshold, and took its place therein. They determined to maintain their rights—rights secured to them and the community, under the forms of a solemn contract (a contract which it would seem an honest church would not repudiate), even if they had to go to the courts to do it. There was no compromise on the part of the Methodist Church people, they saying they would have the whole house or none, and that the key was put into the door to stay. This settled the matter; and to the courts, as a last resort, the appeal was made.

The gentlemen mentioned above, in carrying out their determination, did so knowing that it would involve them in very large pecuniary outlay, whether they were successful or not; but they had been the principal agents in circulating the subscription papers and securing the funds of the community not connected with the Methodist Church, using honestly the guaranteeing clause as a reason for a liberal subscription on the part of the people; they now felt that some responsibility rested upon them, both to secure the house to the use for which it was erected, and to vindicate themselves against any charge of fraudulent action on their part, that might be alleged, in obtaining said money. Thus they made their appeal to the court, without hope of reward, save in the maintenance of their own integrity, and the principles of right and honesty.

THE COMPLAINT.

The following is the complaint they filed in the Noble County Circuit Court, viz.:

"The State of Indiana, on relation of George K. Poyser and William A. King, plaintiff, *vs.* the Trustees of the Salem Church of the Methodist Society of the Haw-Patch Circuit of the Western District of Michigan, *alias* the Trustees of the Salem Methodist Protestant Church, viz., Alonzo T. Poyser, David E. Damy, John Hostetter, John Hite, and Alvin H. Ramsby, defendants.

"The plaintiff, by said relators, complains of said defendants, the trustees of the Salem Church of the Methodist Society of the Haw-Patch Circuit of the Western District of Michigan, otherwise known as the trustees of the Salem Methodist Protestant Church, and says that the said defendant is a religious society and church, organized as a corporation under the laws of the State of Indiana, and the defendants, Alonzo T. Poyser, David E. Damy, John Hostetter, John Hite, and Alvin H. Ramsby, are its trustees.

"And the plaintiff, by said relators, further says, that on the 23d day of March, 1874, and from that time to the year 1878, the defendant corporation occupied, for religious worship, a church building situated on the following described premises, in Noble County, Indiana, to wit.: (The description is omitted.—ED.

"That in the year 1878, said building having become old and inefficient for the needs of the community as a place of worship, the defendant corporation, by its trustees, determined to erect a new building. That at that time there were residing in that vicinity many persons who were members of other Christian churches, and others who, not belonging to any church organization, were, nevertheless, accustomed to attend religious services at said place, and in order to raise the necessary funds to erect a new building, the trustees of said defendant corporation organized themselves into a building committee, and associated with themselves as a member of such committee the relator, George K. Poyser; and, to induce other persons, who were not members of the defendant church, to subscribe to said building funds, said trustees drew up written subscription papers, having a stipulation written in the body of some of said subscription papers, and indorsed upon others, to the effect that the house proposed to be erected should be free to all orthodox denominations, when not occupied by the defendant church, and which subscription papers, with the knowledge and consent of the defendant corporation, were, by said committee, circulated and subscriptions solicited and obtained upon the conditions aforesaid.

"And plaintiff says that, relying upon said stipulations and conditions, the relator, George K. Poyser, subscribed upon one of said papers the sum of $135.00, and the relator, Wm. A. King, subscribed the sum of $125.00, and other persons, not members of the defendant church, also subscribed

various other sums upon said conditions, in all amounting to the sum of $1,400.00; and the aggregate amount of subscriptions so made, by all persons, was about $3,000.00—all made on conditions aforesaid.

"And plaintiff further says, the relators paid their several subscriptions aforesaid in full, as did all, or nearly all, the other subscribers; and all of the subscriptions were accepted by the defendant's trustees, acting for the defendant, and the money paid was accepted by the defendant upon said conditions, and used in erecting a brick church building upon the premises aforesaid, in the year 1879.

"And plaintiff further says that, for some years after the erection of said church building, the defendant permitted other religious denominations to hold meetings and worship in said church building on the Sabbath, as stated and agreed in the conditions aforesaid, in said subscription papers, at such time as the same was not occupied by the defendant church's denomination; that said building is in the country, and away from any village, town, or city; and that the defendant's church was not accustomed to hold religious services upon each Sabbath day; or, if they did, they did not hold such services more than twice a day; and there being members of a religious denomination known as the Christian Church residing in that vicinity, who had made subscriptions to said building fund, and paid the same, who desired to worship in said building, under the ministrations of J. H. Edwards, a minister of said church, in good and regular standing, it was arranged and understood that said minister might hold religious services in said church, at regular intervals, at such time as the same was not occupied by the defendant's church; and, in pursuance of said arrangement, the said Edwards had been accustomed to hold divine service according to the methods of his denomination, in said building; but the defendant has of late changed his appointments so as to interfere with the appointments of the said Edwards.

"And the plaintiff further says, that the said Edwards, and those acting with him, with a view of avoiding any collision or interference with the defendant, changed his appointments to another hour of the day, and so notified the defendant's trustees; and thereupon the defendant, by its trustees, notified the said Edwards that he could no longer hold any religious service or meeting in said church building at any time, except funeral services; and since the 18th day of January, 1883, has, and still does absolutely refuse to permit the said Christian Church denomination, by its pastor aforesaid, and under its ministrations, to worship or hold meeting in said church, except funeral services.

"And plaintiff, by said relators, avers that said Christian Church is an orthodox denomination, and, by the stipulations and agreement in said subscription papers, is of right entitled to use said building, when not occupied by the defendant, or by other orthodox denominations. That the

defendant does not occupy said building at all hours of the Sabbath day, nor does it honestly and sincerely propose so to do; but its purpose is to entirely exclude said Christian Church denomination from holding religious worship in said church building; and plaintiff further avers that the acts of the defendant in the premises, are in direct contravention of its agreement and duty made and imposed by receiving said subscriptions aforesaid.

"And plaintiff further says, that the said Edwards is ready and willing to hold religious services for his denomination in said building, at such hours as the same is not necessarily occupied on the Sabbath day by the defendant's church; and these relators, as subscribers to said fund, with others, also subscribers, and members of said Christian Church, are desirous that said Edwards shall hold meetings and religious services there at such times.

"Wherefore plaintiff, by these relators, asks that this court cause to issue a writ of mandate to defendant, and its trustees, aforesaid, commanding said defendant and its trustees, to permit said Christian Church denomination, under the ministration of said Edwards, to hold religious services in said building, at such reasonable and convenient time on the Sabbath day as the same may not be occupied, and to designate such time; or, in default thereof, that the court may, upon the hearing, determine such time as it will not be needed for use by the defendant's church, and when it may be used by said Christian Church denomination; or show cause why the same may not be done. GEO. K. POYSER.

"WM. A. KING."

Upon this complaint the court issued an alternative writ of mandate, ordering the defendants to so act, or show cause why they should not do so.

The defendants demurred, alleging that the things set forth in the complaint are not sufficient cause for the issue of the extraordinary writ of *mandamus*. The demurrer was argued before the court, but it was overruled, and the defendants were ordered to file their answer. After the usual legal gymnastics, incident to joining of the issues in important cases before a court, the defendants filed the following answer:

THE ANSWER.*

1. The Methodist Protestant Church purchased, June 14, 1849, the parcel of land in fee simple on which the house was built, and the deed was recited. It was claimed that the trustees had no legal right to jeop-

* A summary only of the answers, and the following reply, is given, as this is all that is necessary to give an understanding of the issues as they were finally joined.

ardize the invested rights of the conference by the insertion of the clause in the subscription papers, recited by the plaintiff in the complaint.

2. The second answer set forth the power which the Methodist Protestant Church, under its discipline, has to build, repair, lease, or sell property, in the following words, to wit.:

"Each church or society shall have power, by the concurrent vote of two-thirds of the qualified members, publicly called together for that purpose, to purchase, build, lease, sell, or rent, or otherwise obtain or dispose of property for the benefit of the Methodist Protestant Church."

Also, that—

"The trustees shall have power, when authorized by two-thirds of the qualified members of the society, at a meeting for the purpose, of which meeting at least four weeks' public notice shall have been given, to purchase, build, repair, lease, sell, rent, mortgage, or otherwise procure or dispose of property, and on no other condition or conditions whatever."

It then sets forth that, at the meeting at which the arrangements were made to build the house, there were not present the required two-thirds of the qualified membership; that therefore the trustees had no legal power to build, because the conditions upon which the discipline grants said power had not been complied with, and that, therefore, the clause inserted in the subscription papers, and recited by the plaintiff, is void.

3. "That said denomination, mentioned in the alternative writ, is not an orthodox church: nor is said Edwards a preacher of an orthodox church.

"Alonzo T. Poyser, John Hostetter,
"David E. Damy, Alvin H. Ramsby."
"John Hite,

THE REPLY.

To the foregoing answer, by the defendants, the plaintiff made the following replies, to wit:

1. That the trustees of the Methodist Protestant Church acquired their title from trustees who held only in trust the premises described in their deed, it having been deeded by Conrad Miller and wife, on the 23d day of May, 1836, for a nominal sum ($1.00), for "school-house site, meeting-house site for holding religious services, and for grave-yard site;" and that in accordance with this trust the Presbyterian, Baptist, and Episcopal Methodist Churches were accustomed to hold services thereon; that the trustees, Curl and Hostetter, at the time they deeded it to the Methodist Protestant Church, had no title except as such trustees.

2. The second reply denies that the Methodist Protestant Church was governed by the rule recited in the answer, but by the following:

"Sec. 2. Each church shall have the right to hold and control its own

property, and manage its own local affairs independent of all other associations, relations or bodies."

"SEC. 4. The trustees shall have power, when authorized by a majority of the members, over the age of twenty-one years, assembled at a regular meeting for the purpose, to purchase, build, repair, lease, sell, rent, mortgage, or otherwise procure or dispose of property, and on no other conditions whatever."

That the trustees were authorized by a majority of the members thus entitled to vote; that, with a full knowledge of the proceedings, the church ratified the actions of the building committee and trustees, by more than a two-thirds majority of the members, by accepting said building.

With this the issues were joined, and the cause went to the court.

THE PERSONNEL OF THE CASE.

To inject a vital personality into the narrative, the following *personnel* of the case is given:

The judge who presided over the court, J. Wes. McBride, of Waterloo, is a man approaching middle age, of quick and quite accurate perception, prompt and pushing in business, usually correct in his rulings, and remarkably free from bias in applying the law. Religiously, he is an Episcopal Methodist, having been a member of that church for a number of years. This is the man who was the first to preside over an American court wherein the question of religious orthodoxy was involved.

The official reporter of the court, Mr. George A. Yopst, of Logansport, is a young man of good reportorial qualifications, having reported a number of important cases in other courts. His pencil caught every important item connected with the trial from first to last, as related to the evidence given.

The counsel for the plaintiff consisted of A. A. Chapin, of Kendallville; J. D. Ferrall, of LaGrange, and W. D. Owen, of Logansport. Mr. Chapin, the leading counsel, has always been a Presbyterian in his religious belief. As an attorney he is a man of exceptional ability in many respects, being, when aroused, it is said, almost inexhaustible in honorable resources to combat an opponent, displays of which were frequent in this trial. It must be conceded that it is no mean indication when a man can take the cause of a people, whose teachings and practices have been hitherto unknown to him, except as they have come to him in a desultory way, and to identify himself with them so as to make himself a part of them; and then, amid the balkings of a wily counsel, win for them a consummate victory. This is A. A. Chapin. Mr. Ferrall, likewise, is a man who, by his ability, has risen to an honorable position at the bar, and who, by his quickness to comprehend the scope of a question, and by his tact to coun-

teract any false impression it might make with the proper cross-question, proves himself to be a formidable opponent where the issues involved are of sufficient importance to arouse his energies, as they were in this case; for he is a member of the Christian Church, and he is enlisted, heart and soul, in the success of the great plea which it makes. W. D. Owen is comparatively a young man, being considerably on the sunny side of forty, having made his reputation, not so much as an attorney, as by his brilliancy both as a writer and speaker, and by the suavity of his popular oratory in the pulpit, where he naturally belongs. With his thorough study of the questions involved, and the stimulation of a great crisis upon him, he would have made the master speech of his life could he have been permitted to appear before the jury.

Neither were the counsel for the defense lacking in ability. The leading counsel was Hon. John H. Baker, of Goshen. Associated with him was Hon. W. C. Glasgow, of LaGrange. Both of these gentlemen are men of superior ability. Mr. Baker has represented his district in the national Congress; and Mr. Glasgow was the Republican candidate for Congress at the last election. Both of these men are in the prime of life. Mr. Baker is a tall, attractive man, with high forehead, and pleasing countenance, and is deft and skilful in the handling of his case before the court. Mr. Glasgow is reputed to be a consummate adept in the free and easy use of words in his speeches, and had he appeared before the jury, he would, no doubt, have made the best use possible of this graceful attainment. The defendants have no reason to be ashamed of their counsel. Mr. Baker is an ardent member of the Methodist Episcopal Church; and Mr. Glasgow is a member of the Presbyterian Church. Both of these gentlemen, being warmly attached to their own churches, and their doctrines, were determined to fasten the stigma of "heterodoxy" upon the church opposed to them before the court.

Following is the list of jurymen who constituted the panel to try the case, as brought in by the sheriff: John Newland, Washington Y. Leonard, John C. Foot, Wm. W. Riddle, Jas. A. Hamlin, Washington W. Cleland, D. Berger, Jos. B. Riddle, Jos. M. Shew, Chas. Breidert, Washington A. Coon, and Franklin P. Kiblinger. These men have been facetiously called "the twelve apostles of the State of Indiana to determine what orthodoxy is." It was insisted upon by the counsel for the plaintiff that all the issues of the case be tried by the judge alone; but this he refused to do, saying that he had already prejudged the matter, and was compelled to ask for the instruction of a jury upon the point of orthodoxy involved; hence the impaneling of the above jury. This jury was made up of ordinarily intelligent men; but no one of them, nor any member of their families, was a member of either church involved in the controversy; in sentiment,

however, some of them were Methodistic, others were Baptist, others were Universalist, and others were of no religious predilection; but all these jurymen went into the jury-box with crude and mistaken notions of the church and its teaching, the orthodoxy of which they were to pass upon.

The witnesses, as far as they were examined on the question of orthodoxy, were J. H. Edwards, pastor of the Ligonier Christian Church; Geo. W. Chapman, formerly elder and pastor of the same church; W. D. Owen, one of the attorneys, and pastor of the Christian Churches of Frankfort and Crawfordsville, Indiana; L. L. Carpenter, State evangelist, in the employ of the Indiana Christian Sunday-school Association; Rev. B. Post, pastor of the Salem Protestant Methodist Church; and Rev. J. W. Smith, a minister and ex-pastor in the Methodist Episcopal Church—these were the witnesses used. There were other witnesses in attendance who were not called to the stand. Among these were Rev. G. W. Barr, of the Presbyterian Church, Rev. Jabez Shafer, of the Lutheran Church (both of these gentlemen were pastors of their respective churches in Albion, the town where the court was held), and various other reverend gentlemen of the Protestant Methodist Church, some of whom had been pastors at Salem Chapel—among them the president of their Conference.

Thus the reader has before him the *personnel* of the case—the judge, the reporter, the counsel, the jurymen, and the witnesses.

THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE PLAINTIFF AND THE DEFENDANT AS TO THE THEORY OF ORTHODOXY.

The defendant's attorneys, no doubt, labored under the conception, as shown in their management of the case, that a systematic and coherent scheme of religion can not be held by a people who take the uncommented, the uninterpreted Bible alone as their standard; that an authoritatively formulated theology is necessary to create a system; and that, inasmuch as the Christian Church has no such formulation, it, as a body of people, is not a unit upon anything, save it may be upon baptism. This state of facts existing, it is, therefore, without any coherent scheme of religion, and must be without the pale of orthodoxy. It will be observed in reading the following testimony how persistently the doctrine of the Trinity was pushed to the front—the very same doctrine over which Alexander and Arius quarreled in Alexandria, both sides of which, by like constituted and responsible authorities (the same authorities in kind, which create formulated theology) have been pronounced both orthodox and heterodox! This unfavorable conception of orthodoxy seems to have been the one under which the defendant's attorneys labored.

But the *onus probandi* was upon the plaintiff in this case, and upon it fell the duty of deploying the line of battle—the line along which was to

be heard the clang of orthodox cimeters. It was asserted in the complaint that the Christian Church is an orthodox church. This was denied in the defendant's answer. On this direct issue the proof was called for. The line of proof determined upon may be summarized as follows:

1. To set up "the Bible, the whole Bible, and nothing but the Bible," to be the only standard by which to determine this question, the same as the apostolic, and immediately subsequent, Christians received the Scriptures.

2. To present the teachings of the Bible, as the teaching is insisted upon by the Christian Church, squarely upon the two great points: *First*, The things which are necessary to bring a man from the world into the Church of Christ, and thus secure to him the salvation from his past sins, viz.: *faith* in the objects (not dogmas) of gospel belief, *repentance*, or turning to reformation of life; *confession*, or the public profession of this faith and repentance; and *baptism* into the trinity of adorable names. *Second*, The things which are necessary to keep a man in the Church of Christ after he is in as long as he shall live, and thus secure to him the everlasting salvation in the kingdom above, viz.: *prayer*, the holy *service of worship*, and the acts of a *fraternal, philanthropic and a pious life.*

3. To insist that upon these things all religious parties who accept the Bible as a revelation from God are substantially agreed, though they may differ somewhat in their manner of presenting them; that is, that all these parties, with one consent, will agree that a man who has faithfully fulfilled all the obligations set forth in the above outline will be saved, according to the gospel promises.

4. To maintain that in these things only can orthodoxy be truly affirmed of any party; that this is the only reasonable Bible orthodoxy there is.

5. That the Christian Church, arraigned before the bar of the court, stands or falls upon this line—if that be orthodox, then it is orthodox; if that be heterodox, then it is heterodox.

Upon this line was the battle fought, though the counsel for the defendant persistently tried to shift it to another.

With the issues all joined, and with the intensest, though subdued, feeling prevailing, the witnesses were directed to stand before the clerk of the court and solemnize the testimony they were about to give with the sanctities of a solemn oath before Almighty God; and they were then put on the stand, one by one.

CHAPTER IV.

THE TESTIMONY.—A VERBATIM REPORT.

State of Indiana, } ss.
Noble County, }

In the Noble Circuit Court, before His Honor, Judge J. Wes. McBride.

The State of Indiana, on relation of George K. Poyser and William A. King, plaintiff, *vs.* the Trustees of the Salem Church of the Methodist Society, etc., ete., defendants.

The above named cause was called for trial by Judge McBride, on the morning of June 19, 1883.

APPOINTMENT OF OFFICIAL REPORTER.

Be it remembered, that at the June term of the Noble Circuit Court, the above entitled cause being called for trial, and the issues being joined, a jury being empaneled, George A. Yopst, a short-hand reporter, being appointed by the court as official stenographer in said cause, after being duly sworn to faithfully report all the evidence in the cause, proceeded so to do; and having made a transcript of the evidence relative to the issue of orthodoxy, or non-orthodoxy of the Christian Church in controversy, it is in the words and figures following, to wit:

SECTION I.

TESTIMONY OF J. H. EDWARDS.

Mr. Edwards, a witness on behalf of the plaintiff, being duly sworn, testified as follows:

Examination in Chief.

Q. Will you please state your name to the court?
A. My name is J. H. Edwards.
Q. Where do you reside, Mr. Edwards?
A. I reside in Ligonier, Indiana.
Q. What is your business?
A. I am a minister of the gospel.

Q. In what church?

A. In the Church of Christ, or Christian Church.

Q. Are you the pastor of the Christian Church in Ligonier?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you hold any position in the Christian Church in the State of Indiana? If so, what?

A. I have recently been Secretary of the Northern Indiana Christian Ministerial Association, and am at present the president of the State Christian Ministerial Association of Indiana.

Q. Mr. Edwards, are you acquainted with the practices and teachings generally of the religious denominations of this country?

A. Yes, sir, I think so.

Q. Please state whether the Christian Church is an orthodox denomination?

A. I think it is.

Q. Has that church any statement or rule of faith and practice to which a member must conform?

A. It has an authoritative statement both as to faith and practice.

Q. What is that church's rule of faith and practice?

A. "The Bible, the whole Bible, and nothing but the Bible."

Q. Will you please state, Mr. Edwards, what the plea of the Christian Church is, as compared with the accepted orthodoxy of other churches?

A. The great plea which I understand the Church to have made is this: The union of all Christians, disciples of Christ, in one body, with the word of God as the basis of that union. The union of all Christians under one head, Christ, is the great plea they make.

Q. What do you mean when you say that all Christians ought to be one, according to the teachings of the Christian Church?

A. I mean they ought to be one in those things which the Scriptures teach as being essential to salvation—the things necessary to one's turning to God and living a holy and pious life.

Q. Now, then, do you mean to say you would permit any differences of opinion?

A. In those things which are merely opinions—in those things we allow the greatest latitude. These things make no difference in the fellowship of the Church.

Q. Does or does not the Christian Church accept the Old and New Testament Scriptures as inspired?

A. It does.

Q. State whether or not the Christian Church demands of its members, and those coming to its membership, a faith in Jesus Christ?

A. It does.

Q. State whether or not it demands a faith in Jesus Christ as a divine being.

A. It does. It always demands a confession of faith in Him as the Son of God.

Q. Well, would or would not the Church accept one as a member who would refuse to make this confession of faith in Jesus Christ as the divine Son of God?

A. It would not.

Q. He would not be accepted as a member?

A. No, sir.

Q. Whose voice does the Church recognize as authoritative in the matters of salvation?

A. The voice of Jesus Christ.

Q. If there be any authoritative commandment which Jesus gave to His apostles concerning the matter of salvation, please state what it is.

A. There is the great commission which Jesus gave His apostles. He said: "All authority is given unto me in heaven and in earth. Go ye, therefore, and make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world." (Matt. xxviii. 18–20.) The Church regards Him as authority in these things—in the matters of salvation.

Q. Does the Christian Church teach that the apostles who went about preaching the gospel had a creed, or command, which Jesus had given them?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. If a man, therefore, should accept this proclamation of the gospel which the apostles made, what relation would it put him into with reference to Jesus? If a man now accepts this proclamation of the gospel which the apostles then made, into what relation does it place him with reference to Jesus?

A. It puts him into the relation of a disciple of Jesus.

Q. Into the relationship of a disciple?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Is this acceptance of the gospel authorized to be preached by Jesus requisite in order that a person be received into the fellowship of the Church, or that he become a disciple?

A. Yes, sir; and he accepts it through his faith.

Q. Does the Christian Church teach that Jesus is the only Counselor, and Guide, and Commander in matters of religion?

A. Yes, sir; it does.

Q. Does it teach that Jesus is the sole Saviour of sinners?

A. It does.

Q. What is the teaching of the Christian Church with reference to the power, authority, and the sacrifice of the Saviour? Does the Church teach that these are necessary and able to effect the salvation of mankind?

A. With reference to the power and authority, and the sacrifice of the Saviour, it teaches that these are sufficient to save all; but that the salvation of men depends upon the acceptance of the gospel, and its agencies of salvation by them.

Q. That the salvation of men depends upon the acceptance of the life, teachings, and sacrifice of Jesus Christ?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. State if the Christian Church accepts Jesus Christ as the object of faith for the Christian.

A. It does.

Q. State if baptism is necessary, according to the teaching of the Christian Church.

A. It is; being accepted as a command of the Saviour, it must be obeyed.

Q. What does the Christian Church teach as the first necessary step on the part of the sinner that he may obtain salvation?

A. That he have faith in God, and in Jesus Christ as the Son of God.

Q. What does that Church next require as necessary?

A. It teaches, and therefore necessarily requires, that the sinner repent of his sins—his former sins—and turn to live a life of holiness and virtue, according to the teachings of the Scriptures.

Q. What next does the Church require as necessary?

A. The sinner having believed in God and in Christ, and having repented of his sins, and turned to live a life of righteousness and virtue, the Church next requires that he confess Christ before men, for the reason that the Saviour has said, "Every one, therefore, who shall confess me before men, him will I confess before my Father which is in heaven. But whosoever shall deny me before men, him will I also deny before my Father which is in heaven." (Matt. x. 32, 33.)

Q. What next does that Church require?

A. It next requires that the sinner submit himself to the command which was given by the Saviour in the commission—the first half of the commission—"Make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit."

Q. What next does that Church require?

A. That he conform to the second half of the Saviour's commission—"Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you,"

thus living prayerful and pious lives, continuing that obedience until the close of life.

Q. After the sinner has had faith in Jesus Christ, and has repented of his sins, and has confessed Christ as the divine Son of God, and has been baptized, what is the teaching of that Church as to the effect of these things upon the condition of the sinner?

A. It teaches that he is then received into the fellowship of God, and becomes His child, and that, so far as the sins of his past life are concerned, they are remembered against him no more.

Q. That process makes him a Christian?

A. Yes, sir; and he ought to be received into the Church.

Q. Mr. Edwards, did the Saviour and His apostles ever require by a commandment faith in any other object, or person, than Jesus of Nazareth, and God?

A. No, sir, I think not.

Q. Did the Saviour and the apostles ever require any other belief and acts of obedience, as you term them, as prerequisites to membership in the church, than faith in Christ, confession of Him, repentance of sin, and baptism?

A. I know of none, sir.

Q. Are you the gentleman who preached in Salem Chapel?

A. I am, sir.

Q. Please state to the court and jury whether or not, in your preaching in Salem Chapel, you preached what are said to be the doctrines of the Christian Church.

A. Yes, sir. I think, so far as I can now tell, I kept wholly within the line of them in my discourses there.

Q. I wish to ask you now, Mr. Edwards, if the denomination you represent, and for whom you were preaching at Salem Chapel, believe and practice the things you have stated on the stand, and which you say you have preached there?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. How long did you preach at Salem Chapel?

A. Well, I preached once in February, I think, of 1882. Then I did not preach any more until in April, of the same year. From that time, with the exception of one or two Lord's days, I preached every alternate Sunday afternoon until the 7th of January, 1883.

Q. Have you preached there since the time of which you last spoke?

A. I have not, sir.

Q. Why have you not?

A. On account of a notice that was given to me.

Q. What notice?

A. The notice that was read before the court and jury, forbidding any use of the house to me except on funeral occasions.

Q. And it is for this reason that you have not preached there since?

A. Yes, sir.

Cross-examination by the Counsel for the Defendant.

Q. You say you are acquainted with various orthodox denominations?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Will you have the kindness to state the various orthodox denominations with which you are acquainted?

A. Well, I have an acquaintance with the Methodist denomination, with the Presbyterians, and with the Baptists.

Q. Which branch of the Methodist Church do you refer to?

A. Well, I have an acquaintance with the Methodist Episcopal, and also with the Protestant Methodist Church.

Q. Do you recognize the Methodist Episcopal Church as an orthodox church?

A. So far as the Methodist Episcopal Church holds to the essential elements of which I have spoken, I do.

Q. Do you recognize the Presbyterian Church as an orthodox church, or as one of the orthodox churches?

A. In the same way, I do.

Q. Do you regard the Protestant Methodist Church as an orthodox church?

A. Yes, sir; wherein it holds those points I have stated.

Q. In respect to the other points you have not stated, do you regard this Church as heterodox?

A. With reference to that, I would make this statement: The leading differences between Protestant denominations are in matters mostly of minor importance, and so far as these matters are concerned they are mere differences of opinion. We do not make opinions matters of fellowship or non-fellowship. On such doctrines as the trinity, foreordination, predestination, original sin, the decrees, etc., we are content to allow men to hold such opinion as seems good to them, without putting them under the ban of heterodoxy, providing that they truly hold the essential elements, a statement of which I have given. Hence, I do not regard this Church, as a body of people, as heterodox.

Q. You are familiar with the Westminster Confession of Faith?

A. Yes, sir, I have read it.

Q. Do you recognize it as a statement of orthodox belief?

A. It is a statement of orthodox belief so far as it states those points—the essential elements of salvation—which I have enumerated, and in which all professing Christians agree.

Q. Are there any points contained in the Westminster Confession of Faith that you regard as orthodox? If so, state what ones, and what ones as heterodox, if you please.

A. There are teachings in the Westminster Confession of Faith that I consider as orthodox, notably so far as those teachings conform to the statements I have previously made as to the essential elements of salvation; and there are teachings in it that do not harmonize with my opinions—among them the doctrine of foreordination and predestination, unconditional election and reprobation, the decrees, etc. With some this want of harmony in opinions would constitute heterodox-- but with me it does not.

Q. You are acquainted with the faith of the Methodist Episcopal Church?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you recognize the articles of faith of the Methodist Church as being orthodox?

A. In those matters in which there is no variance from the Bible, I do. Wherein it differs from that, in which it states the conclusions of human speculation, or in which it gives merely human opinions, I would not.

Q. What portion of the Confession of Faith and the principles of belief of the Methodist Episcopal Church do you recognize as being heterodox? Do you recognize either of them as being heterodox in any one point of faith?

A. As I have stated before, there are some things about which, among all professing Christians, there are differences, and these differences are usually mere opinions; but where these differences are great, as, for instance, in the Presbyterian Confession of Faith and in the Methodist Discipline, wherein the former confines salvation to an unconditional election, and the latter makes salvation a conditionally free salvation, they mutually destroy the orthodoxy of each, so far as this point is concerned; at least both of them can not be orthodox upon this point.

Q. Do you recognize the Methodist Protestant Church as being orthodox?

A. As I have before stated, yes, sir, in those points I have enumerated.

Q. Well, now, in other points, in the balance of its faith, do you recognize the Methodist Protestant Church as heterodox?

A. I do not know that I need to answer further than to point out its differences from other denominations; those differences will answer the question.

Q. Will you point out the differences to which you allude?

A. Well, one difference between it and the Presbyterians is upon the doctrine of foreordination.

Q. You are speaking of the Methodist Protestant Church?

A. Yes, sir. Now, the Presbyterians teach the doctrine of foreordination, which, I understand, the Methodists discard, and do not teach. So far as that difference is concerned, they testify to each other's non-orthodoxy, and I need not assert whether the Methodist Protestant Church, in any of its teachings, is or is not heterodox.

Q. Will you please give your attention to the question I propounded? I will ask that you state whether the articles of the Methodist Protestant belief, as you regard them, are heterodox, any one of them? and if there are any ones of them that are heterodox, state which ones are.

(To this question an objection was made, but the question was restated.)

Q. If there is any statement, or doctrine, or belief, or faith in the Methodist Protestant belief, or faith, that you regard as unorthodox, please state it.

A. Well, so far as the great essential matters of salvation are concerned, and I associate orthodoxy and heterodoxy with these alone, and not with the things of indifferent human speculation, with which the creeds are so largely filled, I would make no exception.

Q. Is there any one of the doctrines that are contained in the Confession of Faith, or in the doctrine of the Methodist Protestant Church, that you regard as unorthodox, any one of them? If so, state it.

A. I have already answered, none, with the explanation I have given.

Q. Well, I will ask you, if you are able to give any of them, to do so. Taking all the doctrines of the Church, is there any one of them that you pronounce unorthodox, or heterodox?

A. I do not know whether I understand the drift of your questions. Do I understand you to mean what I conceive to be the teachings of the Creed?

Q. I am speaking of the Confession of Faith of that Church. I understand you to say that there are heterodox churches in belief. Now, name some of them if you are acquainted with them. I will ask you to state whether or not, from your knowledge of the Confession of Faith of this particular church—the Methodist Protestant Church—there is any one of the articles of faith recognized by the confessed believers in that Church that you regard as heterodox?

A. Not in those things which they teach which are scripturally essential to bring men into the Church of Christ.

Q. If in any particular, name what?

A. Well, my explanation of this matter, if I understand what you

want, is this: In those things which are necessary to bring men into the Church of Christ, there is great unanimity in the teachings of all the religious denominations; that is, they all agree that when a sinner has faith in Christ, has truly repented of his sins, has confessed Christ, and has been baptized, he has a right to membership in the Church of Christ, and in these matters it is right to regard all of them as orthodox. If orthodoxy consists of the acceptance of these things, and heterodoxy of their rejection, and if all accept them, then all are orthodox; but of speculative and indifferent opinions neither orthodoxy nor heterodoxy ought to be affirmed, and thus I prefer to leave them.

Q. Will you please be so kind as to state to the court and jury what you understand to be the fundamental doctrine of orthodox Christians?

A. Well, I understand that all orthodox Christians receive the Scriptures as the word of God, and as given by the inspiration of the Holy Spirit of God; that Jesus is the world's propitiatory for sin, His blood cleansing from sin; that the agency for leading men to the spiritual blessings of God is the gospel of Christ through the Spirit, these changing the false desires of the heart to the desire to live a holy life; that to become a true child of God, and a member of his spiritual family, the Church, the alien sinner must make a profession of faith in Christ, must repent or turn to a reformation of life, must confess Jesus before men, and before being admitted into the Church there must be a baptism into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit; that, when thus admitted into the family or Church of God, there must be the faithful leading of the prayerful and pious life until death; and then, as a promise of the gospel, that to those who, by a faithful continuance in well-doing, have sought for glory and immortality, eternal life will be bestowed upon them.

Q. Now, do orthodox Christians believe in the doctrine of the depravity of men?

A. I find that doctrine in some of their creeds, but whether or not it is believed, I would not say; yet the so-called orthodox creeds do not all agree upon this point, and it occurs to me that this disagreement contributes to the establishment by each of the other's heterodoxy.

Q. Does the Christian Church believe in the doctrine of the depravity of men?

A. Yes, sir; but not in the doctrine of "hereditary total depravity," as found in some of the creeds.

Q. The Church of which you are speaking is what is known by the name of "Campbellite," and not "New Light"?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Mr. Edwards, does the Campbellite branch of the Christian Church believe in the doctrine of original sin, and of a divine manifestation?

A. The Church teaches that Adam originally sinned by transgressing a command which God had given him in Eden; that on account of this transgression (this sin) he was driven out of the garden of Eden, being thus separated from God; and, on account of this separation from God, he was compelled to live under the circumstances of sin.

Q. What do you say to my question? Does the Campbellite branch of the Christian Church hold the article of faith, or doctrine, that sin has permeated the whole human family by reason of the evil of Adam?

A. It does not teach that the whole human family incurs personal guilt, and thus depravity of soul, in consequence of the sin of the fathers. The fact is recognized that Adam, after his transgression, was enveloped in the terrible consequences of sin; that the children born to him were necessarily placed, to a certain extent, under these sinful circumstances, and were, therefore, liable themselves to sin, and that they thus work out their own depravity.

Q. Does the Campbellite branch of the Christian Church hold to the doctrine that a man can not be saved without baptism by immersion?

A. Will you please state your question again? I did not understand you.

Q. I say, does the Campbellite Church teach that a man may be saved other than by faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, repentance, and being baptized by immersion?

A. The teaching of the Christian Church upon that point is this, as I understand it: It insists that the Scriptures teach the necessity of faith in God and the Lord Jesus Christ, of repentance or turning to a reformed life, of a confession of Jesus as the Son of God, and of a baptism into the trinity of adorable names; that, upon the genuine performance of these things, the Scriptures promise salvation from past sins, and that outside of these things there is no promise of pardon. But the Church does not undertake to say what God can or what He will do outside of the range of His promises; what it does is to urgently plead with men to come within the range of the Scripture promises, contending that the promises of God are yea and amen in Christ Jesus.

Q. I will ask you what is the belief of the Church upon that subject? Does the Campbellite branch of the Christian Church believe, as an article of faith, that a man may be saved without being baptized by immersion?

A. It has no such article of faith to be believed. It does not make such things articles of faith. They are relegated to the domain of opinion.

Q. The members of the Christian Church do not believe that a man can be saved without immersion?

A. They have no such article of faith.

Q. Then you believe a man can be saved without baptism by immersion?

A. Yes, sir; some men. There are classes of men who, I think, will be saved without immersion.

Q. Now, sir, I will ask you whether or not that is the doctrine you taught at Salem Chapel?

A. The question of baptism was not made the subject of discourse at all.

Q. Do you recollect, sir—you do not pretend to say that you recollect all the doctrines you preached at that church?

A. I can tell you, for—

Q. How?

A. I say I can tell you, for I have a list of subjects, and notes, to which I can refer.

Q. Did you not say there that a man can not be saved without being immersed?

A. I do not call to mind that I made any declaration at any time in reference to immersion, for it is not particularly in the line of any of the subjects upon which I discoursed there.

Q. Is it not taught by that branch of the Christian Church that all other churches are heterodox in that they do not receive the Bible without any comment or formulated confession of faith?

A. The members of the Christian Church, as a rule, do not bandy the term "heterodox;" but they teach with reference to the creeds—

(An objection was here made, but the question was repeated.)

Q. Does not that branch of the Christian Church to which you belong hold that the other Christian churches are not orthodox for the reason that they do not receive the Bible without any comment, as the ancient church did, as the foundation of their faith, without the church's formulated confession of faith?

A. Well, I should answer—

(Objection was again made, but the question was repeated.)

Q. Now, then, Mr. Witness, I will ask you to state—to pay attention to that question. You may state whether or not that branch of the Christian Church to which you belong don't consider the other Christian churches heterodox, or unorthodox, by reason of them having accepted as their standard of faith the formulated creed, instead of the Bible without comment.

A. The Church to which I belong has no authoritatively formulated statement of their doctrine, or confession of faith, except the uncommented Bible. The feeling of the Church, I speak of the membership of the Church generally, is that such formulation is contrary to the spirit and teaching of the Bible, in—

(Objection was here made, but the counsel repeated the question.)

Q. Now, then, you say, if I understand you, that you regard in some sense as unsound, as related to the teaching of the Scriptures, that members of the other churches have creeds, and are required to subscribe to these formulated creeds?

A. Yes, sir; that is, the formulated dogmas of human creeds are not made the test of fellowship with the Disciples of Christ.

Q. You think it is in conflict with the teaching of the Scriptures to make members of the Church subscribe to the creed?

A. So far as an authoritative confession of faith, or creed, is concerned, I think it is in conflict with the teaching of the Scriptures.

Q. You think it is in conflict with the teachings of the Scriptures?

A. Yes, sir; I think it is in conflict with the teachings of the Scriptures.

Q. It is in conflict with the teachings of the Scriptures?

A. Yes, sir; it is without divine authority, and is in conflict with the teachings of the Scriptures.

Q. Mr. Edwards, if it is in conflict with the teachings of the Scriptures for those churches to require of their members a confession of articles of faith as a condition to church membership, will you have the kindness to state right here if the orthodox churches, or their disciplines, conflict with the spirit of the gospel?

A. There are some things upon which all the churches are agreed, and there are some things upon which they are not agreed.

Q. On what matters do all the orthodox churches agree?

A. Well, upon those things which I have previously enumerated.

Q. Will you state them again?

A. The matter of faith in God and in Jesus Christ, the acceptance of the Scriptures as the inspired word of God, the propitiatory of Christ, the repentance or turning to a new life, the confession of Jesus Christ as the Son of God, and baptism into the trinity of adorable names.

Q. Now, in your judgment, is it not an essential condition of orthodoxy, and does not the Christian Church hold that baptism by immersion is an essential condition of salvation?

A. The Christian Church holds that there is no baptism only by immersion—immersion as baptism has never been in debate.

Q. Does not your Church hold and teach that baptism by immersion is essential to salvation?

A. Yes, sir; to every man to whom the command comes.

Q. Does the Church hold it?

A. Yes, sir; as she insists upon an obedience to every command of Christ.

Q. Does not the great majority of them teach that baptism by pouring and sprinkling is not sufficient?

A. Yes, sir; they all do.

Q. Does the Church teach that a man could be saved by faith and repentance coupled with being baptized by sprinkling or pouring, or even without being baptized at all? Would you receive a man into the Church that would hold such a doctrine, or is that the doctrine of the Church?

A. The Church holds that the Scriptures promise salvation from past sins upon the terms specified: faith, repentance, confession, and baptism (which is by immersion), and outside of the Scripture promise the Church has no teaching. A man who would not conform to the Scripture requirements would not be received into the fellowship of the Church.

Q. What is the belief of your Church and its teachings in reference to the efficiency of the Holy Ghost in the conversion of men?

A. It teaches that the gospel of Christ is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believes.

Q. It teaches that with the reading of the gospel, and the hearing of it expounded by the preachers as being God's salvation, men and women are saved by it?

A. It teaches that men come into the blessings of the gospel by its being preached to them, for "how shall they believe on him of whom they have not heard, and how shall they hear without a preacher?" But back of this preaching of the gospel lie the provisions which God has made for human salvation in a divine Saviour, and all the accompaniments of His grace and truth which constitute the gospel preached, the preaching of which urges upon men the acceptance of the terms upon which salvation is granted.

Q. Is it the belief of your Church that there is no divine manifestation to men, or that it lies within a man to accept the gospel of Christ of his own volition?

A. Yes, sir; it is believed that men can be constrained to accept the gospel of Jesus through the persuasions of its efficient preaching.

Q. What do you believe as to the manifestation of the Holy Ghost as an instrument in the conversion of men, or the manifestation of the Holy Ghost upon the hearts of men by miraculous power?

A. The teaching of our people is that the Holy Spirit manifests itself upon the hearts of men in their conversion through the instrumentalities of the Church and the word of God. With these instrumentalities the Spirit accomplishes its work upon the minds of men.

Q. What is the teaching of your Church in reference to the influence of the Holy Spirit in the conversion of men?

A. It teaches that men are born again through the Spirit by the heart being impregnated with incorruptible spiritual seed, the word of God. (See I. Peter i. 24.) This word of God speaks of the gospel as being the power of God unto salvation.

Q. Well, is that power from the influence of the word as read and expounded from the Bible, or is it taught that the Holy Spirit has any direct influence upon the hearts of men?

A. Our people are not concerned very much about matters of this sort. They do not push such questions to the front as being all-important, deeming it wiser to agitate those things that involve the duties of men, leaving those things which belong to God and His Spirit to Them, resting in the assurance that, if men will do their duties as respects salvation, God will do the balance; and that, too, in His own way.

Q. But what is the belief of your Church upon that point?

A. I can not assert any belief with respect to it; it is held as an opinion, just as all matters of opinion are held by them—it is not made a test of acceptable membership in the Church. It is taught, according to the Scriptures, that the Spirit of God operates through the Word of Truth. No one pretends to say that God can not, by his Spirit, operate independently of the truth, neither is it asserted whether He does or does not; but it is continually affirmed, according to the Scriptures, that the power of God unto salvation is the great gospel of Christ, and they are more concerned to have it preached than to proclaim their opinions about the Spirit's operations independent of the Word of Truth.

Q. Does your Church hold as its doctrine the divine operation of the Holy Spirit upon the hearts of men? What are the phenomena when men are subjected to that influence? What is your teaching concerning that?

A. I can not give you an answer to that question. I have no data.

Q. Is there any difference in these operations of the Spirit upon the heart—is there any difference in these operations upon the hearts of men when placed in the same circumstances? What is taught in your Church upon that?

A. I know nothing about any teachings upon that question.

Q. Is it taught by your Church that there is no difference in the operation of the Word, as read and expounded, on the hearts of different men, hearing the same Word read and expounded at the same time?

A. I can not call to mind that I ever read or heard any teaching upon that point.

Q. By your Church?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Well, I will ask you whether or not your Church has any belief upon this question. Does or does not the Holy Spirit operate on some men differently than it does on other men, or does the Holy Spirit operate on the mind or heart of a man differently at one time from what it does at another?

A. Well, I shall have to repeat my answer; I do not know that I have ever heard any teaching upon that point.

Q. Is it, so far as you know, the belief of your Church that it would be the same under the same circumstances surrounding a man—that the influence of the Holy Spirit, operating through the Word as read and expounded, would be the same on all?

A. I can not answer for the Church; I have not been instructed upon that point.

Q. Have you any idea upon that point?

A. Yes, sir; I have an individual opinion. I suppose that, if the circumstances are the same, and the condition of the man the same, and the influence is the same in quality and degree, the result will be the same; for the reason that like causes produce like results.

Q. What does your Church teach as to the hearts of men being under the influence of the Holy Spirit? Have you heard, or has there been any teaching upon this point in your Church?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. What is it?

A. It is taught that the Saviour promised to send to the disciples the Holy Spirit if He went away, and that it would be an abiding comforter with them. It is taught that all true disciples have received the Spirit as this comforter to dwell with them and be with them.

Q. What is the belief of your Church in reference to the essential character and being of the Holy Spirit?

A. Well, in answering this question I can do no better than to read a statement of the matters involved in it, which was made by Mr. Campbell, and which I would like to make my answer to this question. It is an extract from the debate between Mr. Campbell and Mr. Rice, upon the proposition: "*In conversion and sanctification, the Spirit of God operates on persons only through the Word of Truth.*" The extract is as follows:

"To accomplish this," speaking of the bestowment upon men of an everlasting righteousness, a perfect holiness, and an enduring blessedness in the presence of God forever and forever, "a new manifestation of the Divinity became necessary. Hence the development of a plurality of existence in the Divine Nature. The God of the first chapter of Genesis is the Lord God of the second. Light advances as the pages of human history multiply, until we have God, the Word of God, and the Spirit of God clearly intimated in the law, the prophets and the Psalms. But it was not until the Sun of Righteousness arose—till the Word became incarnate and dwelt among us—till we beheld his glory as that of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth; it was not till Jesus of Nazareth had finished the work of atonement on the hill of Calvary—till he had brought

life and immortality to light, by his revival and resurrection from the sealed sepulcher of the Arimathean senator; it was not till he gave a commission to convert the whole world, that the development of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit was fully stated and completed. Since the descent of the Holy Spirit, on the birthday of Christ's Church—since the glorious immersion of the three thousand triumphs of the memorable Pentecost, the Church has enjoyed the mysteries and sublime light of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, as one Divinity, manifesting itself in three incomprehensible relations, in order to effect the complete recovery and perfect redemption of man from the guilt, the pollution, the power, and the punishment of sin.

"No one, Mr. President, believes more firmly than I, and no one, I presume, endeavors to preach more distinctly and comprehensively than I, this mysterious, sublime and incomprehensible plurality and unity of the Godhead. It is a relation that may be apprehended by all, though comprehended by none. It has its insuperable necessity in the present condition of the universe. Without it, no one can believe in, or be reconciled to the remedial policy, as developed in the apostolic writings. And, sir, I have no more faith in any man's profession of religion, than I have in the sincerity of Mahomet, who does not believe in the Father, and in the Son, and in the Holy Spirit as coöperating in the illumination, pardon and sanctification of fallen, sinful and degraded man. While, then, I repudiate, with all my heart, the scholastic jargon of the Arian, Unitarian, and Trinitarian hypotheses, I stand up before heaven and earth in defense of the sacred style—in the fair, full and perfect comprehension of all its words and sentences, according to the canons of a sound, exegetical interpretation. I would not, sir, value at the price of a single mill the religion of any man, as respects the grand affair of eternal life, whose religion is not begun, carried on, and completed by the personal agency of the Holy Spirit. Nay, sir, I esteem it the peculiar excellence and glory of our religion, that it is *spiritual;* that the soul of man is quickened, enlightened, sanctified, and consoled by the indwelling presence of the Spirit of the eternal God."

Here the witness was interrupted by the counsel, who said:

Q. Now, when you have finished, I would like to ask you a question with reference to that.

A. Yes, sir.

Q. I will ask you to state whether or not the trinity is one of the doctrines of your Church; is there a denial of the trinitarian belief or doctrine?

A. Some of the scholastic phases of that doctrine are not believed, but the doctrine of the trinity, as set forth in the Scriptures, is believed;

yet this, as well as all other Bible teachings, is left undisturbed, as to its formulated statement, as it is found in the Scriptures.

Q. Then, I will ask you, do all the Unitarians and Trinitarians believe in a heaven and an earth as taught in the Scriptures?

A. I can not answer, but presume they do.

Q. I will ask you to state whether or not the orthodox doctrine of the trinity, as generally received by other Christian churches, is a fundamental doctrine and belief in your Church?

A. I must answer your question by saying: The Church believes in the trinity as unfolded and stated in the Scriptures—to whether or not that corresponds precisely with the various notions and explanations which men have set forth, we pay but little regard.

Q. Does your Church teach the being and personality of the Holy Spirit, or Holy Ghost?

A. I think I read that in my extract from Mr. Campbell; no, I did not read it, I would have read it.

Q. What is the belief of your Church as to the being and personality of God?

A. It believes in the personal existence of God, and in the manifestations of divinity as set forth in the Scriptures.

Q. Well, does your Church believe that there are three persons or beings in the Godhead?

A. As to this question, I can not answer; for I have never heard that question discussed among them.

Q. I want to call your attention to certain doctrines. I ask you whether or not the doctrines which the Presbyterians teach, in your judgment, are orthodox doctrines? Does your Church believe that the sins of the father are visited upon the child, and that man is naturally sinful and totally depraved?

A. The doctrines of the Presbyterian Church, as I have before answered, wherein they conform to the Scripture teaching as to the things necessary to bring a man into the Church, and keep him there, whereby he receives the present and eternal salvation, I should say were orthodox; but wherein they are the deductions of scholastic and speculative theology, they are of so little true value that neither orthodoxy nor heterodoxy ought to be associated with them—they ought to be relegated to the realm of opinion, and allowed to rest there. The Christian Church does not teach that the guilt of the father's sins is visited upon the children, though it recognizes the fact that the consequent circumstances of the father's sins envelop the children; neither does it teach that man is naturally sinful and totally depraved.

Q. Does your Church hold or believe, as an article of faith, that by

the sins of Adam all men are rendered sinful, or does your Church hold that all men are entirely depraved?

A. I have just answered that it does not. While it does not make these things articles of dogmatic faith, yet I believe that it is not generally accepted that the taint of Adam's guilt was communicated to his children; but being born under the conditions and circumstances incident to a state of sin, they are liable to sin themselves, and thus become sinful. Hence it is not taught that men are entirely depraved.

Q. Does your Church hold that in the other world men will be permitted to dwell with God, and that they will be held accountable for their actions?

A. It is one of the blessed promises of the gospel, which they so love to preach, that we shall be permitted to dwell in the presence of God in "the land beyond." It is presumed that all moral beings will be held responsible for their actions in all time.

Q. Does your Church teach as one of its doctrines, and accept the inspiration of the apostles in the plan of redemption for sinful men?

A. Yes, sir; the unquestioned authority of the apostles in matters of redemption is one of the cardinal things upon which they insist.

Q. And in the development of the plan of redemption the Divinity was made manifest to His creatures as the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; and that these three, which partake of all the attributes of God, are entitled to receive divine worship, and constitute the only real and true God?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you hold that men are justified by faith?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you hold in your Church that this faith results in a holy life and salvation?

A. It is held that faith is a principle which produces action; that in the line of a holy life and salvation the actions which it produces, or which spring up at its behest, are repentance, confession, and baptism; these acts are tests of faith, and bring one to justification from the sins of the past; these are followed by other faithful acts, the deeds of piety and prayer, which lead on through holy life to the final salvation. Thus faith is the motor which moves the activities and instigates the deeds which determine the outcome of life.

Q. Well, do you hold to the doctrine of justification by faith?

A. Well, with the explanation I have just given, I do.

Q. Well, the question calls for an answer, yes or no.

A. In accordance with the explanation, yes; otherwise, no.

Q. Then, from the form of your answer, you do not receive, or you would not accept, the doctrine of justification by faith?

A. I do not, only in accordance with the explanation.

Q. Does your Church teach a universal salvation, and that men to a certain degree are responsible for their actions?

A. Will you please repeat your question?

Q. I say, does your Church teach a universal salvation, or that persons to a certain degree are responsible for their actions?

A. Yes, sir; that is, the salvation prepared in God's redemption is extensive enough to include all men; but, they being responsible for their deeds, this salvation is available only to those who truly and sufficiently accept it.

Q. What do you understand by the atonement in your Church?

A. The sacrifice which was made by Christ for sin; that which He did by which sinful men and a holy God can be made at one. The sacrifice which Christ made of Himself because of the sin of men. Perhaps I had better further explain. It is taught that faith results in a man turning to God; that in the sacrifice of Christ, in the atonement for man's sins, his disabilities are taken away, and therefore he may finally be brought into the presence of God to enjoy Him forever; that all this is accomplished through the instrumentality of the Lord Jesus Christ.

Q. Do I understand you that faith in the Lord Jesus Christ is sufficient?

A. It is sufficient to call forth the activities of men.

Q. Is it sufficient to secure salvation?

A. It causes men to turn to salvation.

Q. To turn to salvation?

A. Yes, sir; but it is not taught that it will secure salvation only in that that faith in God will call forth and develop the elements of a Christian character.

Q. Now, then, repentance of sin, faith in the Lord Jesus Christ as the Saviour of the world—what other essential elements does your Church regard as necessary to salvation—that a man may be saved?

A. Do you mean the elements necessary to salvation?

Q. The elements necessary to salvation?

A. Yes, sir; the Church regards as necessary to salvation an obedience to all things involved in the Saviour's command to His disciples in the great commission. The Saviour commanded His disciples to go into all the world and preach the gospel to all nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, and requiring them to observe all things whatsoever He had commanded them. This is the commission which Jesus gave to the apostles. In the fulfillment of this commission, in remaining faithful in these things, there is secured the promise of salvation both from past sins and in the life to come; all of these things it regards as necessary to salvation.

Q. Your Church, then, does not believe that a man may be saved by repentance and faith in the Lord Jesus Christ. I will repeat my question: Do you believe in the doctrine of justification by faith?

A. Yes, sir; by a living faith.

Q. That men may be justified or made just with God?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. How is this? If that can be done, if by faith men are justified, why do you assume that without baptism any would be lost?

A. Faith, as already explained, is a principle which involves action; baptism is a faith act; where the faith acts are wanting, the faith itself, which justifies, is wanting.

Q. You think, then, in your Church, that a man is justified—that and nothing more. Well, do you think a man thus justified would be in a condition to receive the Saviour?

A. Yes, sir; I think he would.

Q. Are there any other conditions by which he obtains pardon—that is, by prayer, or anything of that kind?

A. It is taught that by a living faith a sinner is justified and brought into relations of justification with God; then after these relations are established, the efficacy of prayer and confession to secure pardon is taught.

Q. Are there any other commandments prescribed or spoken of in the Scriptures?

A. There are the practical duties of Christian life.

Q. These are all that are essential?

A. Yes, sir; all that I have spoken of in my answers.

Q. Does God work in the same way now; does he accomplish his purposes in respect to persons through this power of faith and these works?

A. It is taught that God, and the faith which permits Him to dwell in the heart, are manifest through works.

Q. And that faith alone, not accompanied with all these things, does not save from sin?

A. Upon this point the Church teaches what the Apostle James has taught that "faith without works is dead."

Q. That faith alone is dead?

A. Yes, sir.

Reëxamination by the Plaintiff.

Q. Mr. Edwards, I will ask you if the Christian Church teaches that baptism without a previous change of heart is available?

A. It does not.

Counsel for the plaintiff here asked that the witness be allowed to read the balance of the extract that was commenced on the cross-examination. Permission being granted, the witness read as follows, from page 616, Campbell and Rice's Debate:

. . . "But while avowing these my convictions, I have no more fellowship with these false and pernicious theories that confound the peculiar work of the Father with that of the Son, or with that of the Holy Spirit, or the work of any of these awful names with that of another; or which represents our illumination, conversion, and sanctification as the work of the Spirit without knowledge, belief, and obedience of the gospel, as written by the holy apostles and evangelists, than I have with the author and finisher of the Book of Mormon.

"The revelation of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit is not more clear and distinct than are the different offices assumed and performed by these glorious and ineffable Three in the present affairs of the universe. It is true, so far as unity of design and concurrence of action is contemplated, they coöperate in every work of creation, providence, and redemption. Such is the concurrence expressed by the Messiah in these words, "My Father worketh hitherto, and I work;" "I and my Father are one;" "Whatsoever the Father doeth, the Son doeth likewise;" but not such a concurrence as annuls personality, impairs or interferes with the distinct offices of each in the salvation of man. For example, the Father sends his Son, not the Son his Father. The Father provides a body and a soul for his Son, and not the Son for his Father. The Son offers up that body and soul for sin, and thus expiates it, which the Father does not, but accepts it. The Father and the Son send forth the Spirit, and not the Spirit either. The Spirit now advocates Christ's cause, and not Christ his own cause. The Holy Spirit now animates the Church with his presence, and not Christ himself. He is the head of the Church, while the Spirit is the heart of it. The Father originates all, the Son executes all, the Spirit consummates all. Eternal volition, design, and mission belong to the Father, reconciliation to the Son, sanctification to the Spirit. In each of these terms there are numerous terms and ideas of subordinate extent, to which we can not now advert. At present, we consider the subject in its general character, and not in its particular details.

"In the distribution of official agency, as it presents itself to our apprehension, with reference to the subject before us, we regard the benevolent designs and plan of man's redemption as originating in the bosom of the Divine Father; the atonement, or sacrificial ransom, as the peculiar work of the Messiah; and the advocacy of His cause, in accomplishing the conversion and sanctification of the world, the peculiar mission and office of the Holy Spirit."

Q. Mr. Edwards, I will ask you to state whether or not the Christian Church, as a society, believes in Jesus Christ and His divine institutions?

A. Yes, sir; it does.

Q. State whether or not it takes Christ as the only head of the Church, and the Word of God as the only rule of faith and conduct.

A. Yes, sir; it does.

Q. State whether or not the Church teaches that a person who loves the Lord Jesus Christ, and obeys the gospel of our Saviour, ought to be deprived of church membership?

A. It teaches that he ought not to be thus deprived.

Q. State whether or not any man, who is generally right in those matters of the Church, but who expresses an uncommon opinion in the minor matters, would be accepted as a member?

A. Yes, sir; he would be. The strictest conformity is urged to the positive teaching of the Scriptures, the widest latitude is allowed in the indifferent things of opinion.

Q. That is all.

CHAPTER V.

SECTION II.

TESTIMONY OF REV. B. POST.

Rev. B. Post, a witness in behalf of the plaintiff, being duly sworn, testified as follows:

Examination in Chief.

Q. Mr. Post, I believe you are pastor of the defendant Church, the defendant corporation, the Methodist Protestant Church.

A. Yes, sir.

Q. How long have you occupied that position?

A. Since last October.

Q. The first of October last?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Mr. Post, I will ask: Are you acquainted with the doctrines and practices of your Church, the Methodist Protestant Church?

A. Somewhat.

Q. Are you acquainted with the practices and doctrines of the Christian Church?

A. Well, somewhat; I am not fully conversant with them.

Q. How have you gained your knowledge of the doctrines of the Christian Church?

A. By reading their history, and somewhat by observation.

Q. What history do you refer to when you speak of their history?

A. Well, I refer to Jeter's history and exposition of Campbellism.

Q. Jeter?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. What denomination does he belong to?

A. The Baptist, I suppose.

Q. The Baptist denomination?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Then he is not a member of the Christian denomination?

A. No, sir.

Q. To what other histories do you refer?

A. Alexander Campbell's recent work.

Q. To what do you refer when you speak of Alexander Campbell's recent work?

A. The Christian System.

Q. Have you read the book?

A. I have read sketches.

Q. You have n't read it clear through?

A. Not entirely.

Q. When was that book published?

A. I can't remember that.

Q. When did you first see it?

A. I think about the first of January, perhaps a little later.

Q. The first of January?

A. Perhaps a little later.

Q. Mr. Post, will you tell us what is the meaning of the word "orthodoxy"?

A. Sound in Christian faith, as I understand it.

Q. Sound in Christian faith?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. In your opinion, what is essential to orthodoxy in religious denominations?

A. First, a thorough knowledge of the Divine Person.

Q. Well?

A. It is essential, and we require of the members of our Church a faith in the doctrine of the trinity as it is generally admitted.

Q. Well, what next?

A. A faith in the material Godhead.

Q. What next?

A. A faith in the personality of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, and in their operations.

Q. Well, what next?

A. A belief in the efficacy of the atonement of Christ.

Q. What else?

A. Repentance.

Q. What next?

A. Faith in Christ as the Saviour.

Q. Yes, sir?

A. These, perhaps, are the principal points I would make.

Q. Then you would regard as orthodox the denomination, or denominations, which has, 1st, a thorough knowledge of the Divine Person and a belief in the trinity; 2nd, if they believe in the personality of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit; 3d, if they believe in the efficacy of the atonement of Christ; 4th, if they believe in repentance of their past sins; and 5th, if

they have faith in Christ as the Saviour; now, these constitute your definition of orthodoxy?

A. Yes, sir; principally.

Q. A belief in the personality of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit. Is there anything else you desire to add?

A. A belief in the personality of the Holy Spirit—I believe I added that.

Q. Now, that, you say, constitutes orthodoxy?

A. Perhaps not entirely, but those are the principal things involved in orthodoxy.

Q. Well, if any denomination believes them, and practices them, you would regard it as an orthodox denomination?

A. If it accepted the doctrine of the trinity in its full meaning.

Q. Well, you do not mean to make that item alone the test of orthodoxy, do you?

A. Principally—not alone—it is one of the fundamental principles.

Q. One of the fundamental principles? and these other things you have stated would have to enter into the principles of orthodoxy?

A. I would consider them essential—I would consider them essential to the doctrine.

Q. What do you mean by the Divine Personality?

(Objection was made to this question.)

Q. Is that what you mean by the doctrine?

A. I understand a knowledge of the Divine Personality to imply a Scriptural belief in the Godhead.

Q. A scriptural belief in the Godhead?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. In one?

A. Three persons in one Godhead, all equal in power, authority, and glory.

Q. Then that constitutes it, does it? What scriptures do you refer to when you speak of the Scriptures?

A. The scriptures of the New Testament, principally.

Q. Can you give a passage in the New Testament scriptures to which you refer?

A. Well, I would say as to that what Christ said, "I and my Father are one." That is the first passage I would quote. That would go to show the unity of the Godhead.

Q. "I and my Father are one"? Now, what others?

A. Well, He says, in speaking of His disciples, "If I go away I will send a Comforter," referring to the Holy Spirit, and He said, "He will abide with you," speaking to the disciples.

Q. Yes, sir?

A. He was to bring them a witness by that appearance (I speak of the Holy Spirit as a renewer and sanctifier), and through this they were to test the operation of the Holy Spirit.

Q. Well, I am now asking principally for the passages of scripture to which you refer?

A. Well, perhaps I am not able to recall them at first. The best way to get the doctrines of the New Testament is to read them.

Q. Will you state what the doctrine of the trinity is?

A. It is three personalities, all of equal power, authority, and glory, and which consists of the creating and preserving power of the universe, as I understand it, in the provision of His works.

Q. Well, is that the definition you first gave of the trinity, or the doctrine of the trinity?

A. Perhaps I could make it more elaborate.

Q. Well, I want to know if you desire to accept the definition as your belief?

A. Of the trinity or Godhead, is that what you mean?

Q. The doctrine of the trinity as you spoke of it?

A. I think that embraces the main points.

Q. The main points?

A. Yes, sir; to me they do.

Q. Well, now then, if a person believes in the statement you have just made as expressing the doctrine of the trinity, you would consider him orthodox in that respect?

A. In that respect.

Q. Now, if a candidate expresses a belief in the doctrine of the trinity as you have defined it, the personalities of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, and believes in the efficacy and control of Christ, and repents, and believes in Christ as the Saviour, would you admit him to your Church?

A. Upon a profession of his faith in that doctrine, I would.

Q. Would you admit him into your Church without baptism?

A. I would, if he was satisfied upon that point without that condition; if not, I should attend to that ordinance.

Q. Is not baptism one of the requisites to the admission of members into your Church?

A. It is really a prerequisite with regard to Christian duty—we do not make it a prerequisite to all admissions—we do not always make it a prerequisite to the admission of them.

Q. You admit them, then, on probation, the same as the Methodist Episcopal Church?

A. Yes, sir,

Q. You regard the sinner as on trial, do you not?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Would you regard a church as orthodox, Mr. Post, that did not accept the rite of baptism of the sinner, or would not administer it to those persons?

A. I do not think I would regard it as orthodox.

Q. Do you require, or does your Church require, or believe in baptism as necessary to regeneration, or the new birth?

A. Baptism is the result of the work of Christ in the heart, or rather a sign of that work.

Q. A sign of it?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you mean the result, or a sign?

A. A sign of the work of Christ in the heart.

Q. What are the conditions required of those who apply after probation to obtain membership in your Church?

A. A desire to flee from the wrath to come, an acceptance of the blood of the Lord, and a willingness to do the duties He laid down in the Word.

Q. Does or does not your Church regard this one of the elements, or principles, and a part of its constitution as a Christian church, a belief in Christ and the divineness of His institutions?

A. Oh! yes, sir.

Q. Second, that Christ is the only Head of the Church, and His Word the only Word for its guide?

A. Oh! yes, sir.

Q. Third, that if a person loves the Lord Jesus Christ, he ought to be admitted to church membership?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Fourth, that every man is entitled to the free expression of an opinion that does not conflict with the laws and notions in the main?

A. I accept that fully?

Q. Mr. Post, I will ask you if you indorse this doctrine as orthodox doctrine: "The revelation of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit is not more clear and distinct than are the different offices assumed and performed by these glorious and ineffable Three in the present affairs of the universe. It is true, so far as unity of design and concurrence of action are contemplated, they coöperate in every work of creation, providence and redemption." (*Campbell and Rice, p. 616.*) Do you approve of that doctrine?

A. In the main, I do.

Q. How is that, sir?

A. In the main, I do.

Q. What exceptions do you make?

A. In the first place, I think the Father began to create—the expression is not quite complete.

Q. Not complete?

A. Well, I think possibly the word Son ought to be Father, Son, and Holy Spirit; I think they are instrumental in the work as well.

Q. You are satisfied upon that? That He began His creation by the personal efficacy of the Holy Spirit, so far as the Holy Spirit is concerned?

A. So far as it is concerned.

Q. Do you believe this doctrine: "Such is the concurrence expressed by the Messiah in these words—'My Father worketh hitherto, and I work,' 'I and my Father are one,' 'Whatsoever the Father doeth, the Son doeth likewise;' but not such a concurrence as annuls personality, impairs or interferes with the distinct offices of each in the salvation of man. For example: The Father sends his Son, and not the Son the Father. The Father provides a body and a soul for the Son, and not the Son for the Father. The Son offers up that body and soul for sin, and thus expiates it, which the Father does not, but accepts it. The Father and Son send forth the Spirit, and not the Spirit either. The Spirit now advocates Christ's cause, and not Christ his own cause. The Holy Spirit now animates the Church with his presence, and not Christ himself. He is the Head of the Church, while the Spirit is the heart of it. The Father originates all, the Son executes all, the Spirit consummates all. Eternal volition, design, and mission belong to the Father; reconciliation to the Son; sanctification to the Spirit"? (*Campbell and Rice, p. 616.*) Do you believe that?

A. If I understand it, I do.

Q. How is that?

A. If I understand it, I do. Please read a little louder.

Q Well, that is good trinitarian doctrine, is it not, Mr. Post?

A. Principally, I think it is.

Q. You say principally; is there anything in that that you can characterize as not being trinitarian doctrine?

A. The whole world being created by the efficacy of the Spirit, I would not fully indorse.

Q. I have not stated it in that light—if I have, it is certainly a mistake.

A. I said I could not understand.

Q. I will read again: "To accomplish this a new manifestation of the divinity became necessary. Hence the development of a plurality of existence in the Divine Nature. The God of the first chapter of Genesis is the Lord God of the second. Light advances as the pages of human his-

tory multiply, until we have God, the Word of God, and the Spirit of God clearly intimated in the law, the prophets and the Psalms. But it was not until the Sun of Righteousness arose—till the Word became incarnate and dwelt among us—till we beheld his glory as that of the Only Begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth; it was not till Jesus of Nazareth had finished the work of atonement on the hill of Calvary—till he had brought life and immortality to light, by his revival and resurrection from the sealed sepulcher of the Arimathean senator; it was not till he gave a commission to convert the whole world, that the development of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit was fully stated and completed. Since the descent of the Holy Spirit, on the birthday of Christ's Church—since the glorious immersion of the three thousand triumphs of the memorable Pentecost, the Church has enjoyed the mysteries and sublime light of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, as one Divinity, manifesting itself in these incomprehensible relations, in order to effect the complete recovery and perfect redemption of man from the guilt, the pollution, the power, and the punishment of sin.

"No one, Mr. President, believes more firmly than I, and no one, I presume, endeavors to preach more distinctly and comprehensively than I, this mysterious, sublime and incomprehensible plurality and unity in the Godhead. It is a relation that may be apprehended by all, though comprehended by none." (*Campbell and Rice, p. 615.*) How is that?

A. Well, I think in the main that is good doctrine.

Q. Well, you say in the main; what exception would you make?

A. Well, the first part of the statement, as I understand it, says that God is a unity in glory, stature, and power, and that His glory was made manifest by the Son and Spirit; this I would accept, but I do not agree in the position in relation to the Holy Spirit.

Q. The statement that the Father was made manifest by these two Persons—do you believe that?

A. I do.

Q. That the Father is one, and that the Son and Holy Spirit in the union are combined in the work of remission, and they are one?

A. Well, I believe they were combined in the work of remission.

Q. Yes, sir?

A. Still, I believe there is a Divine Quality.

Q. In the language of the Saviour, "I and my Father are one"—is that your understanding?

A. Well, I would include the Holy Spirit as well.

Q. The union of God and Son in the Saviour?

A. Yes, sir; I suppose it is.

Q. That, of course, you say you accept as authoritative?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. I will read you this, and see if you are willing to consent to this doctrine: "I do, sir, most sincerely regard the Spirit of God as the author of every spiritual and noble desire in the human heart; the author of every pious affection, of every holy aspiration of our souls. His mysterious but certain power is in and with the gospel, and He makes it the power of God to evéry one that believes it. He sanctifies us through the truth. He works in us by it to will and do of his good pleasure. He is the Spirit of grace, because he is the Spirit of truth." (*Campbell and Rice, p. 701.*) Do you consent to that doctrine?

A. I do.

Q. Do you consent to the following doctrine: "I believe and teach the inspiration of the Spirit, the influences and effects of the Spirit of God in the hearts of all Christians, both men and women. The man who represents me as opposed to a spiritual religion, and the operations, converting and sanctifying, of the Holy Spirit, does me the highest injustice, and blasphemes my good name in a way he must answer for in a higher tribunal. I have long been endeavoring to draw the proper lines between a wild enthusiasm and a true Spirit of our God—between what is spiritual and animal in some of the present forms of Christianity; and to save my contemporaries from a religion of blind impulses, animal excitements, and new revelations, by which I most sincerely believe vast multitudes are deluded to everlasting ruin. With Paul, and with me, there is but one body and but one Spirit, as there is but one hope of our calling—as there is but one God and Father of us all." (*Campbell and Rice, p. 751.*)

A. I indorse that.

Q. Now, Mr. Post, a man who believes in that doctrine, isn't he orthodox?

A. So far as that goes.

Q. Now, what constitutes orthodoxy, so far as it goes?

A. I think there is a literal quality of the Divine Person—I do not think it is perfectly clear.

Q. Wherein?

A. In the same you read.

Q. Well, do you find that in the passages which say, "The Father and Son are one," and "I and the Father are one"? You do not find anything in the last passage I read to indicate that the Father and the Spirit are not one, and that they are not equal, more than you do in those, do you?

A. Well, in appearance, I do not think I do.

Q. Can you quote any particular passage of Scripture which teaches the literal quality of the Divine Person to which you allude?

A. I do not know as I can designate one specifically.

Q. Can you quote any passage of Scripture which states that the Father, and Son, and Spirit are one in quality, uniformity, and glory?

A. Well, I am not able to just call one to mind. I do not recollect any at present.

Q. You could not state any of them?

A. My memory is treacherous in these phases.

Q. Mr. Post, would you, or would you not, believe a man was orthodox if he believed in baptism by immersion?

A. That would depend upon whether or not he accepted the other fundamental doctrines of the Christian Church—I would not criticise a man for that.

Q. If a man accepted the other fundamental doctrines of the Christian Church, and he did not ask for baptism, or he did not believe in baptism at all, you would not reject him on account of baptism?

A. No, sir.

Q. Now, if a man believes in the doctrines I have stated, and accepts them with the New Testament as the inspired word of God, and as the prescribed means whereby he may be saved, would you regard him as orthodox?

A. If he lived out, or practiced, what he professed.

Q. You would regard him as an orthodox Christian?

A. Yes, sir; I suppose I would.

Cross-Examination by the Defendant.

Q. You say that you have read Jeter's exposition of the system of this Christian or Campbellite Church?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And also that you have read the book I hold in my hand entitled, "The Christian System," by Alexander Campbell?

A. I have not completed it, I have read sketches along there.

Q. Now, Mr. Post, I want to know of you whether or not you regard church as holding orthodox Christian faith that teaches this: "I affirm, hen, that the institution, in which we can meet with God, is the institution for remission. And here it is worthy of notice, that the apostles, in ll their speeches and replies to interrogatories, never commanded an inquirer to pray, read, or sing, *as preliminary to his coming; but always commanded and proclaimed immersion as the first duty, or the first thing to be done, after belief of testimony.* Hence, neither praying, singing, reading, repenting, sorrowing, resolving, nor waiting to do better, was the converting act. Immersion *alone* was the act of turning to God. Hence, in the commission to convert the nations, the only institution mentioned after proclaim-

ing the gospel, was the immersion of the believers, as the divinely authorized way of carrying out and completing the work"? (*Christian System, p. 209.*)

A. I would consider such a denomination as unorthodox, if this doctrine was believed.

Q. Well, without that—I have quoted from page 209 of the *Christian System* by Alexander Campbell—what would you say? Would you say that a Christian church which held this dogma of faith, or belief, is orthodox?

A. I would not.

Q. "And from the day of Pentecost to the final *Amen* in the Revelation of Jesus Christ, no person was said to be converted, or turned to God, until he was buried in and raised up out of the water"? (*Christian System, p. 209.*)

A. I would not consider that as orthodox.

Q. And the church that holds that as one of the essential doctrines of faith you think is not an orthodox Christian church?

A. Yes, sir; I think it is not.

Q. What would you say to this doctrine: "If it were not to treat this subject as one of doubtful disputation, I would say that, had there not been some act, such as immersion, agreed on all hands to be the medium of remission, and the act of conversion and regeneration, the apostles could not, with any regard to truth and consistency, have addressed the disciples as pardoned, justified, sanctified, reconciled, adopted and saved persons"? (*Christian System, p. 209.*)

A. I would consider it as unsound doctrine.

Q. And the church that holds that doctrine, would you say it is orthodox or heterodox?

A. Heterodox.

Q. Let me ask you this question. On page 216 of this book, I find the following: "The application of water, the cleansing element, to the body, is made the gracious institution to reach the conscience, as did the blood of sprinkling under the law." What do you say to that doctrine?

A. I think it is not scriptural.

Q. In your judgment, is it, or is it not orthodox?

A. I think it is not orthodox.

Q. I will ask you to state, sir, whether or not the belief which has just been stated, and with which you are familiar by your experience with it, is the belief, or doctrine, of this Christian Church. I will ask you whether or not the doctrines I have just called your attention to are some of the doctrines of this Church?

A. They are, as I understand them.

Q. Would you hold that a church—a Christian church—is orthodox which believes the doctrine that a person must necessarily be damned, or be eternally lost, if he repented of his sins, and believed, and was baptized by sprinkling? What would you say of one who denied that there is any other method of Christian baptism, save by immersion or being plunged into the water?

A. I would say that it is unsound doctrine—not scriptural.

Q. Would that be orthodox or not?

A. I should think it would not be orthodox.

Q. What would you say of a Christian—a Christian denomination—which held that? Would you say it is orthodox, or not, for a Christian denomination to hold immersion as one of its essential elements of faith, and that immersion is necessary to conversion?

A. I should decide in my mind that this is not orthodox doctrine.

Q. I will read from this book again: "Now, as soon as, and not before, a disciple, who has been begotten of God, is born of water, he is born of God, or of the Spirit. *Regeneration is, therefore, the act of being born.* Hence its connection always with water. Reader, reflect—what jargon—what a confusion, have the mystic doctors made of this metaphorical expression, and of this topic of regeneration! To call the receiving of any spirit, or any influence, or energy, or any operation upon the heart of man, regeneration, is an abuse of all speech, as well as a departure from the diction of the Holy Spirit, who calls nothing personal regeneration except the act of immersion." (*Christian System, pp. 201–2.*) What would you say of the orthodoxy of that church which holds as one of its essentials of belief that immersion in water is the synonym for Christian conversion?

A. I should think that it is not orthodox, so far as it went.

Q. What would you say of a church which held that being born again, as spoken of by James and other apostles, is being immersed in the water? Would you consider a church which held that as an essential of its belief as orthodox or not?

A. I would not if it made that an essential of faith.

Q. And again: "He is born again who is raised up out of the grave of water;" do you consider that as orthodox? Do you consider the church as orthodox which considers immersion, or being buried in the water, and then raised out of it—which considers that as being born again?

A. I would not consider that as orthodoxy.

Q. I will ask you, Mr. Post, whether or not the following statement which I read from the Shorter Catechism, or Confession of Faith—you may state whether or not you consider as orthodox the Presbyterian doctrine of baptism: "Baptism is a sacrament, wherein the washing with water, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost,

doth signify and seal our ingrafting into Christ, and partaking of the benefits of the covenant of grace, and our engagement to be the Lord's." (*Shorter Catechism—Westminster Confession of Faith, p. 398.*)

A. I would accept that as orthodox.

Reëxamination by the Plaintiff.

Q. Mr. Post, I will ask you this question: The following quotation was read from this book: "Hence, neither praying, singing, reading, repenting, sorrowing, resolving nor waiting to be better, was the converting act. Immersion alone was the act of turning to God." Now, then, you regard praying and reading and singing as preliminary to coming to Christ?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Now, sir, will you please tell us of any place where the apostles ever demanded praying, reading and singing as preliminary to coming to Christ, and if that is the exact rhetorical statement of the doctrines of the apostles?

A. In that quotation there?

Q. Yes, sir. Where does an apostle express himself as regarding praying, and reading, and singing as always preliminary? They demanded immersion as a duty first, and these were to be attended to afterward; do you say that is not true?

A. I think that the Apostle Peter commanded them to repent.

Q. Did he not command them to repent, believe and be baptized, and was not that alone their duty, if they believed in the New Testament?

A. Well, perhaps it was.

Q. Well, sir, is n't it so declared by the apostles? And as the counsel has asked whether or not it is orthodox, and you have answered, I will ask you for a single passage of the Bible wherein the statement from *The Christian System* is contradicted.

A. Perhaps I am at a loss to recall any passage.

Q. Now, then, with reference to this praying, and reading, and singing, and repenting; do you say that these are converting acts—that praying is a converting act, that singing is a converting act, that reading is a converting act, that repenting is a converting act?

A. Yes, sir; they are agencies.

Q. Do you say that they are converting acts?

A. They are acts leading to conversion.

Q. Now, sir, you do n't mean to say that they are converting acts?

A. No, sir; no one alone.

Q. Well, would all the acts be a converting act?

A. The converting act, I suppose, would be through the forgiveness of sin.

Q. Was believing one of the acts commanded, or not, and necessary to conversion or forgiveness of sin? If so, then you agree with Mr. Campbell in this doctrine?

A. Perhaps all of them are requisite.

Q. What is that?

A. They are requisite.

Q. Do you say that praying, or singing, is requisite to conversion?

A. I think it is.

Q. Then you think a man can not be converted withou he sings?

A. I suppose it has not been commanded.

Q. Well, when you say "requisite," do you mean simply an accompaniment?

A. Perhaps it might be so considered.

Q. Now, then, the opinion which you gave on the passage is that immersion alone is not the act of coming to God; will you now state what the feasible acts of conversion or turning to God are?

A. Well, asserting our belief in the Father and the Son.

Q. Is it immersion alone?

A. It is the influence of faith.

Q. Now, is not baptism the feasible act of turning to God?

A. Perhaps the profession of faith in Christ would be considered the feasible act.

Q. Yes, sir; you say the feasible act is a profession of faith in Christ?

A. Rather the informal expression of it, or confession, is the feasible act.

Q. I will now ask you this question: Is not immersion alone, as Mr. Campbell says, the feasible act of turning to God?

A. I think not alone.

Q. You think not? What else is there?

A. It requires an effort by which we bring ourselves into that frame of mind in which we receive the Spirit.

Q. Now, sir, in speaking of immersion you expressed your notions in respect to that institution. I now want to know if the apostles did not always command sinners to repent and turn from their sins and be baptized; and can you find a single instance of any person known to be converted until he was buried in and raised up out of the water? Is there an instance in which the apostles spoke of a person being converted or turning to God until he was baptized, or until he was buried in and raised up out of the water—a burial by baptism? Will you give a single instance?

A. Well, in the Acts—Lydia and her household.

Q. What were they to do?

A. They were to believe.

Q. What else?

A. They were to be baptized.

Q. To be baptized?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Then the command was to be baptized, was it not?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Then is it not the instruction and command in the word of truth—in the commission given by the Lord to convert all nations—is not the word "baptism" used in the commission, and linked with the promise of salvation? is it not true that there is no promise of remission of sin unless the men to whom the command comes are baptized, as Mr. Campbell says, from the commission until the final amen in Revelation? Is there any promise to them until they are buried in the water and raised up out of the water, or baptized? Is that not a true statement of a Biblical fact?

A. I think there are instances, but I can't recall them.

Q. Can you give one?

A. I am not able to quote any other ones.

Q. Mr. Post, do you attempt to say that this is not orthodox doctrine? Now, if you call this heterodoxy, where can you point out a single instance in which it is shown to be untrue?

A. I fail to recall any at present.

Q. Well, we 'll leave this here at present. There is another question I desire to ask you in reference to the book before I leave it. Counsel has read you the following passage: "To call the receiving of any spirit, or any influence, or energy, or any operation upon the heart of man, regeneration, is an abuse of all speech, as well as a departure fron the diction of the Holy Spirit, *who calls nothing personal regeneration except the act of immersion.*" (*Christian System, p. 202.*) Now, how did you understand this when you pronounced it not orthodox?

A. I meant to say that in that expression I considered him as saying that immersion is the equivalent to conversion.

Q. Upon this point I will read you further from the book: "But, before we dismiss the sixth evidence, which embraces so many items, I beg leave to make a remark or two on the propriety of considering the term 'immersion' as equivalent to the term 'conversion.'

"Conversion is, on all sides, understood to be a turning to God. Not a thinking favorably of God, nor a repenting for former misdeeds; but an actual turning to God, in word and deed. It is true that no person can be said to turn to God whose mind is not enlightened, and whose heart is not well disposed towards God. All human actions, not resulting from previous thought or determination, are rather the actions of a machine than actions of a rational being. 'He that comes to God,' or turns to him

'must believe that God exists, and that he is a rewarder of every one who diligently seeks him.' Then he will seek and find the Lord. And 'external conversion' is no conversion at all. A turning to God with the lips, while the heart is far from him, is mere pretense and mockery. But, though I never thought any thing else since I thought upon religion, I understand the 'turning to God' taught in the New institution to be coming to the Lord Jesus, not a *thinking* about doing it, nor a *repenting* that we have not done it; but an *actual coming* to him. The question then is, Where shall we find him? Where shall we meet him? Nowhere on earth, but in his institutions. 'Where he records his name,' there alone can he be found; for there alone has he promised to be found." (*Christian System, pp. 208–9.*) What have you to say? Did you understand the writer before?

A. I understand him now, I should think.

Q. Do you understand him now as you did before?

A. I do not just now.

Q. I thought not.

A. I understand the writer to mean that immersion is the institution where the Lord has recorded his name, and where the blessings of his promises are to be secured.

Q. You now see how easy it is to be mistaken. You were asked by counsel whether or not a man who is a believer in the following doctrine is orthodox: "The application of water, the cleansing element, to the body, is made the gracious institution to reach the conscience, as did the blood of sprinkling under the law." (*Christian System, p. 216.*) Do you now say that this is not Biblical doctrine?

A. I would not attempt to say.

Q. You would n't?

A. No, sir.

Q. Why not?

A. Because I consider the application of the Spirit as the cleansing power of the soul. I do not think water is the cleansing agency in this case.

Q. Mr. Witness, you say the Spirit is the cleansing power? Isn't the blood of the Saviour the cleansing power?

A. Applied.

Q. What is it?

A. Applied.

Q. And with the application by the Spirit the water cleanses and purifies as did the blood of sprinkling in the law; so the blood of sprinkling in the law was an institution to reach the conscience?

A. It had a similar purpose.

Q. It had a similar purpose? Now, Mr. Witness, I will ask you if

you believe that baptism is the ordinance wherewith sins are washed away, and also that it is a sign of regeneration and a new birth—do you believe that?

A. Yes, sir; in the main.

Q. What is it you say?—that you believe that? Is that not the doctrine of your Church?

A. Yes, sir; I think it is substantially.

Q. How is that?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. "Baptism is a sacrament of the New Testament, wherein Christ hath ordained the washing of water in the name of the Father, and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, to be a sign and seal of ingrafting into himself, of remission of sins by his blood, and regeneration by his Spirit." Do you believe that?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. You believe that?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Well, now, Mr. Baker has examined you in regard to the question of baptism. I desire to ask you still further concerning it. I read the following: "The kingdom of God is no party, no one party on earth. It is a spiritual kingdom, and is in the hearts of men: consisting not in meats, drinks, creeds and covenants, 'but in righteousness, peace and joy in the Holy Spirit.' Into this no one can enter without faith, and the Spirit of God. *Baptism into Christ*, the effect of faith, is a sensible introduction into this spiritual state, and outwardly unites us with the public profession; but when properly understood, spiritually, sometimes called mystically, or under the symbol, inducts into an intimate, near and holy union with the Saviour of the world, by his Spirit. This outward act, then, is but the symbol of the transaction, *inward and spiritual*, by which our souls are bathed in that ocean of love, which purifies our persons, and makes them one with the Lord. *Without this, being born of the water, or being connected with a church, is nothing—worse than nothing. Hence, without previous knowledge, faith and repentance, immersion, into the name, etc., is a mere outward and unprofitable ceremony.*" (*Campbell and Rice, p. 493.*) What do you say of a man who believes that, especially as he has elsewhere said that a man may be immersed in the river Jordan seven times without a previous change of heart and receive no benefit from the immersion; is that good orthodox doctrine?

A. I would accept that.

Q. Mr. Post, is that not the doctrine of the Christian Church?

A. I do not think it is, in full.

Q. You don't think it is? Why don't you think so?

A. Well, from what I have—well, not from my information of it?

Q. Do n't you know that Mr. Campbell declared and believed that doctrine?

A. I suppose he did.

Q. Do you pretend to say it is not the doctrine of the Church?

A. It is, if I am able to understand Mr. Campbell; it depends a great—

Q. It depends for its orthodoxy on whether you understand the reading or not?

A. I am not sure about that.

Q. What is it?

A. I am not sure about that.

Q. Do you pretend to say, sir, that the Christian Church makes baptism a saving ordinance?

A. I do not think the CHRISTIAN Church does.

Q. Well, I mean by the *Christian* Church, the Disciples' Church, if you like.

A. I do.

Q. Where do you find that doctrine?

A. I find it in the usages of the different churches.

Q. In the usages?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Is that your explanation?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Will you explain the usages by which you say that baptism is set forth as a saving ordinance?

A. It seems to be accepted—at least it is quite generally consented to. The Campbellite element, or church, manifestly insists upon baptism more than any other Christian society.

Q. More than any *other Christian* society?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Now, then, you say that it is accepted, or it is the general sentiment?

A. Yes, sir; I think it is.

Q. Is that all you know about it?

A. I think I have reason to believe so from experience in different localities, and from talks with different individuals.

Q. Well, Mr. Post, did I understand you to say, in answering Mr. Baker's question, that a denomination which regards immersion as the only proper mode of baptism is not orthodox?

A. I think I said that I would not consider it orthodox, so far as it went.

Q. Well, what did you mean by that?

A. I meant, sir, that I do not think that immersion constitutes a qualification of orthodoxy.

Q. Mr. Post, is there any denomination, or church, within your knowledge which does not acknowledge immersion to be the proper mode of baptism?

A. There are in fact no churches.

Q. Mr. Post, I will ask you this question again: Is there any denomination, or church, which you call orthodox, that does not recognize immersion as the proper mode of baptism?

A. Well, perhaps there is none, in the full acceptation of the term; there are churches which do not practice immersion, however.

Q. Now, sir, what you call in common parlance immersion is baptism, and what you call baptism is immersion, is it not?

A. As I understand it.

Q. Now, sir, you say these are orthodox churches?

A. I would not make immersion the test of orthodoxy.

Q. Some of the churches believe that immersion is the only proper method of baptism, do they not?

A. I think they do.

Q. Now, then, you say that you would not make immersion, or belief in immersion, the test of orthodoxy or heterodoxy?

A. Not in the main.

Q. And if a person believes in immersion as the proper, and the only proper method of baptism, but still further believes that immersion ought to be followed by a desire to lead a new and holy life, do you say that the person or church that holds to that is heterodox?

A. I would not think it is heterodox.

Q. Well, do faith and repentance, or belief in the Lord Jesus Christ, constitute the test of orthodoxy?

A. So far as that would go I would consent to it as orthodox doctrine.

Q. Now, do you desire in the reëxamination to qualify the first statement you made, that to be orthodox you require first a knowledge of the Divine personality, and a belief in the doctrine of the trinity or personality of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, a belief in the efficacy of the atonement of Christ, and also repentance and faith in Christ as the Saviour—do you want to modify that statement of orthodoxy?

A. I wish to modify it in that I would qualify the statement by saying the Divine Person.

Q. What is it?

A. I would say the Divine Person of the Holy Spirit and of the Son.

Q. And a person who believes that baptism by immersion is the only proper method of baptism, you would still say he is orthodox, would you?

A. So far as that is concerned, I would regard him as orthodox; I would not make that the only test.

Q. Do you believe the following to be orthodox doctrine? "God, by an eternal and immutable decree, out of his mere love, for the praise of his glorious grace, to be manifested in due time, hath elected some angels to glory; and, in Christ hath chosen some men to eternal life, and the means thereof and also, according to his sovereign power and the unsearchable counsel of his own will (whereby he extendeth or withholdeth favor as he pleaseth) hath passed by, and foreordained the rest to dishonor and to wrath, to be for their sin inflicted to the praise of the glory of his justice." (*Westminster Confession of Faith, pp. 179–80.*)

(The defendant objected to this question, but it was repeated.)

Q. Do you believe in that doctrine?

A. I do not.

Q. Do you know of any church that believes that doctrine?

A. I do not.

Q. Is not that the doctrine of the Presbyterian Church?

A. It has been.

Q. Is not that an article of Calvinism or Presbyterianism?

A. I do not believe they accept it now.

Q. Do you know of any Presbyterian who does not indorse that doctrine?

A. Well, I think I do.

Q. What is his name?

A. The pastor of a Presbyterian Church in this place.

Q. Mr. Barr?

(The question was not answered.)

Q. That is all.

CHAPTER VI.

SECTION III.

TESTIMONY OF W. D. OWEN.

Mr. Owen, a witness in behalf of the plaintiff, being duly sworn, testified as follows:

Direct Examination by the Counsel for the Plaintiff.

Q. You may state your name to the court and jury.

A. W. D. Owen.

Q. Where do you reside?

A. I reside in Logansport, Indiana.

Q. You may state whether or not you are a member of any church; and if so, what one.

A. I am a member of the Christian Church.

Q. How long have you been a member of the Christian Church?

A. Some thirteen or fourteen years.

Q. What relation do you sustain to the Church?

A. I was at one time a pastor in the Church.

Q. How long did you act as a pastor in the Church?

A. About nine years. I continue to preach.

Q. You may state, Mr. Owen, whether or not you are acquainted with the teachings of the Christian Church.

A. I am.

Q. You may state whether or not you recognize it as being orthodox in its teachings.

A. I do.

Q. You may state to the jury the points which constitute orthodoxy.

A. The points of a true orthodoxy, as recognized by the Protestant churches, are: An acceptance of the Holy Scriptures and all they teach; faith in the Lord Jesus Christ as the Saviour of men; repentance; confession unto salvation; baptism; and those things which constitute a holy and pious life.

Q. You may state the teachings of the Disciples' Church on these various points which you say constitute the doctrine of orthodoxy among the Protestant churches.

A. The Church teaches the inspiration of the Scriptures; that the Father, Son and Holy Spirit are each divine and form a Trinity in Unity; that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, and the Saviour of the world; that the Holy Spirit is the active agent of God, through the gospel, in the salvation of the sinner; that a man must have faith in Christ, repent of his sins, confess the Saviour, and be baptized; and following this there must be a Christ-like life.

Q. You may state whether or not the various churches in their teachings, or their written creeds, vary, or differ somewhat, from each other in their statement of their doctrines and teachings.

A. Yes, sir; they differ.

Q. Why are not the articles of faith in any one of the churches the standard of orthodoxy among all the Protestant churches?

A. For the reason that each of the "Articles of Faith" contains more than the standard of orthodoxy. I will illustrate that.

Q. Yes, sir.

A. The Presbyterian Confession of Faith asserts the doctrine of election and foreordination; that a certain number of men and angels are from all eternity elected to salvation, and a certain number of them condemned to everlasting damnation. But the Methodist discipline does not teach that a definite number of men are thus elected to eternal life, and a certain number are elected to everlasting damnation; it teaches that man is a free moral agent, and, without being antedated by a divine edict, he believes to salvation, or rejects to condemnation. Here is a difference of opinion between these two churches. The statement of either one of them upon free grace can not be accepted as correct by the other—they do not make the belief upon this point the test of orthodoxy.

Q. You may state whether or not orthodoxy at the present time is what it has been in the past, or whether it has changed.

A. Orthodoxy, so-called, has changed; that is, it is not to-day what it was, say one hundred years ago.

Q. Wherein has it changed?

A. Less than a hundred years ago, to be orthodox, one had to believe in endless punishment by literal fire and brimstone, in miraculous conversions, and that the concerns of life were largely controlled by special providences. Orthodoxy does not now require such ultra views of God's dealings with humanity.

Q. There has been something said, Mr. Owen, in the examination here, about another Christian Church. Do you known of any other Christian Church than the denomination known as the Christian or Disciples' Church?

A. Yes, sir; there is such a body. Their reformation was under the

leadership of Barton W. Stone, and it was started near the time that the Campbells began their work.

Q. About when was that time?

A. In the early part of this century.

Q. Proceed now with your statement.

A. Do you want me to refer to the history of the Church?

Q. I mean by that whether or not the other one of the Christian churches you speak of is a part of the Disciples' Church, or is it independent?

A. Neither one was an off-shoot from the other.

Q. What is that?

A. Neither one was an off-shoot from the other. Barton W. Stone was independent and original in his movement. He accepted the Bible alone as his rule of faith and practice. Mr. Campbell discovered they were acting upon the same principle, but were interpreting the Bible differently in some essential particulars, and were going to distract the world with two more churches, propelled by a like plea, yet warring with each other. The two great reformers finally had a protracted interview, discussing the gospel plan of salvation, which resulted in a union of their movements, Stone accepting the correctness of Campbell in the prominent points wherein they had differed. The larger part of the Stone congregations came with him into the current reformation. Many, however, did not do so.

Q. You may state what the rule of faith and practice in the Christian Church is.

A. It is the Bible alone.

Q. Has there ever been any written or formulated creed put forth by that Church?

A. Never, at any time.

Q. Has there ever been, by the authority of the Church, any doctrine or any writings of its leaders formulated, as teaching the doctrines of the Church?

A. There never has been by the authority of the Church.

Q. You may state whether or not the Christian Church believes in this: "I believe in God, the Father Almighty, Maker of Heaven and earth."

A. Yes, sir.

Q. You may state whether or not the Christian Church believes this doctrine: "I believe He created me, that He gave and still preserves the faculties I possess, and that He requires me to serve, obey and believe Him."

A. I believe it, and so does every member of the Church.

Q. State whether the following is believed by the members of the Christian Church, and taught by it: "I believe in Jesus Christ, his only Son, our Lord; who was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary; suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, dead and buried; he descended into hell; the third day he arose from the dead; he ascended into heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of God, the Father Almighty; from thence he shall come to judge the quick and the dead."

A. Yes, sir.

Q. You may state whether or not your Church believes and teaches the following doctrine: "I believe in Jesus Christ, in his sufferings and death, and that he lives and reigns throughout all eternity."

A. It does.

Q. You may state whether or not the Christian Church believes and practices this doctrine: "I believe that He (God) gave me my form and my reason, and that through His Son Jesus Christ He will give me everlasting life."

A. Yes, sir; we preach and believe it.

Cross-Examination by the Counsel for the Defendant.

Q. Mr. Owen, I understand you to say that your Church has no written creed; is that correct?

A. That is correct.

Q. No creed?

A. No creed, separate and apart from the Word of God.

Q. No summary of belief at all, separate and apart from the Holy Scriptures?

A. None whatever.

Q. No creed or discipline in name stating the doctrine, distinct and apart from the Bible?

A. None in name, distinct and apart from the Bible.

Q. Suppose a member of your Church and yourself were to read the Bible and believe differently. Now, as you get your different beliefs from the same Bible, would he be entitled to his belief as much as you would be to yours—would your Church allow such a state of things as this?

A. No, sir; not in the latitude you mean to imply.

Q. Would he be allowed, according to the belief and practice of your Church, to put such a construction upon the Bible as he pleased?

A. No, sir; not such a construction as he pleased.

Q. What would interfere?

A. The Bible.

Q. Then the declaration of the Bible would be just the same as that of the creed?

A. That is it exactly.

Q. Suppose that you and I both read the Bible and differ radically in our beliefs, could we not both belong to your Church?

A. Am I to suppose the doctrine—

(Objection was made to this question, but it was repeated.)

Q. If you and I were both to read the Bible and get our faith or belief from it, but by putting radically different constructions upon the statements of the Bible these beliefs were to be radically different, could we both belong to your Church?

A. No, sir; not in every case of radically different construction and belief.

Q. What would there be to prevent it?

A. Perhaps I can answer that by giving an illustration.

Q. Well, give it.

A. Suppose that two persons take the Bible to study it. They may both read it; and one of them may come to the conclusion that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, the other that he is not divine. Now, the one who would refuse to accept Jesus Christ as the Son of God and divine could not become a member of the Christian Church.

Q. Well, Mr. Witness, what creed or what doctrine is there to settle the practice? what is there to decide the matter? and I want to ask you further, what is there to decide any question?

A. The Testament of the Lord Jesus Christ and the epistles written by His apostles. These decide the matters for the Christian Church precisely as the statements of creeds decide matters for other churches. The Bible is our creed.

Q. Is a member of your Church allowed to put any construction upon any passage of Scripture which he may choose, without the interference of the Church?

A. No, sir.

Q. What is the doctrine, or belief, of your Church?

A. The Church accepts the Bible as its only rule of faith and practice. It speaks where the Bible speaks, and is silent where it is silent. It takes the Scriptures without comment or interpretation of men, and accepts the Bible, the whole Bible, and nothing but the Bible.

Q. Who compose your Church?

A. Obedient believers in the Lord Jesus Christ.

Q. Is that the only definition you give as defining your Church?

A. As a definition, I might enlarge upon it.

Q. How do you determine the construction a believer is to put upon the Bible, or any part of it?

A. I do not know that I grasp your question.

Q. How do you determine the construction, or meaning, which you understand your Church to get from the Bible concerning any doctrine?

A. The scholastic jargon of sectarianism causes the public mind to rest in a strange misapprehension of the Bible doctrine. That part of the Bible which treats on the things necessary to salvation does not require a "construction." All the statements concerning the necessary matters in salvation are plain commandments of things to be done by the sinner. Personally, I feel that God would not be good in placing the words of eternal life in such a darkened way that an interpretation of them would be necessary. If such be the fact, the apostle made a mistake when he spoke of the gospel as being God's revealed plan of salvation. Neither do I feel that he is all-wise, if a "construction" be required upon these essentials of salvation; because experience has shown that finite men have differed in the construction to be placed upon these things, and by the conflicts growing out of these different constructions the church has been desolated for fifteen centuries. On the matter of human depravity, the direct operation of the Spirit, the eternal decrees, the freedom of the will, and the whole array of intricate and profound theological problems, known as scholastic divinity, the Bible has not given a formulated statement, nor required a specific faith. The members of the primitive Church, doubtless, differed upon these great questions. As they have no necessary connection with salvation, God has left us free to whatever opinion we may prefer. And all the statements concerning the necessary matters in salvation are plain commandments of things to be done by the sinner. So, I answer, as a church, we do not have any "constructions to determine."

Q. Is there any body, or stated person under authority, to whom you can refer to determine any disputed point?

A. There is no dispute on those points which go to make up real orthodoxy; and this fact emphasizes the divine correctness of our position. All questions on other points are left in that same liberty which the Scriptures so plainly indicate.

Q. Do I understand you to accept the form of orthodoxy which the Baptist Church maintains?

A. That depends.

Q. In the main, you refer questions in the Christian Church to what authority?

A. To the Word of God.

Q. Is your creed written or printed?

A. Neither, only as it is found in the Bible; there is no necessity for another creed in the Christian Church.

Q. By what authority do you determine the correctness of any construction of the Bible for the admission of a person into your Church?

A. No construction is needed. The apostles have stated the things to be done. Our requirements are those recorded in Acts of the Apostles where they preached the gospel and admitted persons into the Church.

Q. O Mr. Witness, you are too vague.

A. Then inspiration is too vague, and the apostles were unable to record the movements of the sinner coming into Christ, so that others coming afterward should be able to follow in his footsteps.

Q. How are you to determine whether or not you are orthodox?

A. By comparing our practice and teaching with the divine standard.

Q. Who is to determine what is accepted by the orthodox Baptists?

A. I presume it is whoever determines what has been accepted.

Q. How is that? I do not hear.

A. I presume it would be determined by this.

Q. How do you mean by this?

A. That orthodox body.

Q. Would that answer the question of how they are to determine who is to be admitted?

A. You misunderstand me. We would, if called upon, determine that by the authority of the original Church—the divine standard, which is the Bible.

Q. The original Church, you say? By what authority do you determine the correctness of any construction of the Bible for the admission of a person into your Church?

A. I restate the fact which I stated in answer to a previous question, that as a Church—that is, by Church authority—we do not determine constructions of Bible statements. Permit me to give a demonstration of how we determine questions that pertain to the admission of any one into the Church: In the second chapter of Acts it is related that, when Peter had preached the first gospel sermon and the people believed it and inquired what they must do, Peter told them to repent and be baptized into the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of their sins. We then read that as many as gladly received his word were baptized, and that the same day there were added to the number of the disciples about three thousand souls. We find that in the cases of the jailer, Philip, Lydia, Paul, and indeed in all the recorded cases of pardon, there was an exact agreement with the steps taken in the Pentecost conversions. The Pentecostans heard and obeyed three distinct commandments: 1. They pronounced their faith in the Saviour. 2. They repented of their sins. 3. They were baptized. Now, when these commandments came—to have faith in Jesus, to repent, to be baptized—each of them required an act to obey it. No construction was to be placed upon them. The Almighty had given them their construction, it was a designated act of obedience. There was nothing for the

willing heart to do but to obey. This is what was done from Pentecost forward, in every recited case in the Acts. All these are spoken of as being in the Church—as having been translated from the world into Christ. Hence, the steps of admission into the Church of Christ are constructionless. An Infinite Wisdom has so decreed it. He has commanded that men pass through certain steps, and they pass into the Church. The Christian Church does not go beyond what is here commanded. It has "determined" when it follows the examples given by divine authority. It requires the willing sinner to obey these commandments, and he is thus admitted into the Church.

Q. Is it correct when you say that there are many things, or doctrines, in the so-called orthodox churches which you would accept?

A. Yes, sir; those points, or doctrines, of the orthodox creeds are accepted by the Christian Church which are according to the teaching of the Scriptures.

Q. Who is to judge, or determine, what churches are orthodox concerning these announced doctrines?

(To this question objection was made, but it was answered.)

A. No one, except the Church itself.

Q. Suppose, Mr. Witness, a man professes unbounded belief in the Bible, and is a member of your Church, but is manifestly an atheist. Now, how are you to determine whether he is to be allowed to remain in the Church, or whether he is to be excluded?

A. The Bible informs us on that point that he is a heretic; and being a heretic, he is not to be admitted; and if admitted, he is to be excluded.

Q. Yes, sir; that is true, but he claims to recognize the Bible as true, yet he professes atheism.

(To this question objection was made, but it was answered.)

A. But an atheist does not recognize the Bible as true, for he rejects the gospel of Christ. He is without faith, and whatever is without faith is sin. Manifestly professing atheism, he could not be in Christ's Church.

Q. That is your answer. Well, now, to the question involved in the doctrine of immersion, as to whether it is orthodox or not. Suppose I was a member of your Church, and I should reject the doctrine of immersion, claiming that the Bible did not teach it at all, and I would obtain baptism by sprinkling; I want to know whether I would be right or wrong, and if wrong, why?

A. You would be wrong. There has never been any difference among scholars as to the meaning of the anglicized word "baptize." They are in an unbroken harmony on immersion as the primary meaning. Liddell and Scott, in the first edition of their Greek lexicon, placed sprinkling as its meaning, trusting to a popular religious practice to sustain them. But

scholarship means integrity, and scholarship frowned sprinkling out of the second and succeeding editions. There is no scholar, with a reputation as broad as his continent, there is no Greek lexicon or dictionary, but what asserts immersion to be the meaning of baptize; and in no instance do they, primarily, admit pouring or sprinkling. The original word which our Saviour and the apostles used meant, as applied to this command, to be enveloped in water, just as our word immerse means it. In fact, they used a word that did not require a "construction"—the word signified an act, as immersion does now. Again: our Saviour calls baptism a birth. Nothing can represent a birth except it come forth from a complete envelopment. The apostle calls baptism a burial—"buried with him in baptism." A thing can not be said to be buried except it be entirely "covered up." So the Scriptures take the two solemn acts of life, the one at the opening, the other at its close, the surroundings of which are known to all humanity, and make them the type of baptism. Baptism is a birth, a burial—a complete envelopment. If you were to reject this you would be wrong. One reason for this is that you have not been buried with your Saviour by baptism.

Q. Who determines that that is the only mode of baptism practiced by the apostles?

A. A united learning. The Bible does not record any other.

Q. What body of the Church does? Take them all together, is that the announced doctrine of the Church?

A. Yes, sir; the universal Church.

Q. Where was it, and by what authority was it accepted?

A. By the universal practice of the Church.

Q. Do you mean gradually, little by little; or is immersion the accepted doctrine?

A. It is accepted by the universal Church; it has been so from its beginning.

Q. When was it begun by the Christian Church?

A. I think it was about the year 1823, when the first churches were being established.

Q. Does the Church accept it as a body?

A. It does.

Q. Has the belief remained unchanged down to the present time?

A. Yes, sir; it has remained unchanged, but there seems to be a change in all the religious bodies orthodoxly.

Q. 1820, did you say?

A. 1823.

Q. 1823. Now, Mr. Witness, if I understand you correctly, your Church belongs to the Alexander Campbell branch?

A. It belongs to Christ's branch.

Q. Now, does it not belong to the Campbell branch? Did not the witness assert that yesterday? Will you state what is proper?

A. I would state that the Church has rejected "Campbellite" as its name, and from the beginning requested to be called the Christian Church, or Church of Christ.

Q. Now, then, Mr. Witness, what is the doctrine of your Church in regard to baptism? Does it, in fact, teach that it is the result of belief?

A. It teaches that it is faith that brings a man to obedience, and that through obedience he is brought into the body of Christ.

Q. Do you mean by faith alone?

A. Oh! no, sir.

Q. Very well. Explain the word faith. Give the meaning of it.

A. Faith means a trust in Christ, which manifests itself by obedience to His gospel.

Q. Yes, sir. Now, in what respect has that doctrine changed?

A. The doctrine has not changed. Originally it had the same meaning in the Church.

Q. Practically speaking, Mr. Witness, there has been no change in the doctrines of your Church?

A. There has been none.

Q. What has been the doctrine of your Church is the doctrine to-day?

A. I will add to that, before I pass, my statement that the essentials are substantially the same. The essential principles remain unchanged.

Q. Then, if I understand you correctly, they are the same?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Then were not the true doctrines of your Church originally announced by Alexander Campbell himself, and Thomas Campbell?

A. Were they announced?

Q. Are the doctrines which are accepted now the doctrines which were originally announced by the Campbells?

A. In the main they are.

Q. Now, then, what was the teaching of your Church in 1823 on the subject of regeneration?

A. That it is being born again.

Q. I ask you to state to the jury what your Church accepted, or taught, originally on the subject of regeneration.

A. It has taught that regeneration embraces in it a leaving of the world and a coming into the body of Christ, or becoming a Christian person.

Q. Pertaining to the original definition, I ask you to tell the jury what your Church originally accepted as the doctrine of regeneration.

A. That entire reformation which takes place in a man on coming into Christ.

Q. Is that the definition you have given according to the Scriptures?

A. Yes, sir; that is the definition we have given according to the Scriptures.

Q. What relation does baptism bear to regeneration?

A. It is the overt action of Christian birth.

Q. Did not your Church consider baptism and regeneration one and the same thing, synonymous, as late as 1839?

A. No, sir, it did not, in the light of your statement of the case.

Q. What about the teaching of the Disciples as to regeneration and baptism—what relation do they bear to one another?

A. We teach that baptism is the consummating act in coming to God. The Saviour had a conversation with Nicodemus wherein He tells him that a man must be born again of the water and the Spirit before he can enter into the kingdom of heaven. But the water does not purify the heart—faith does that. The baptism is what a lawyer would call the legal act on entering Christ.

Q. Will you repeat that, Mr. Witness? Did not Alexander Campbell always teach that?

(Objection was made to this question, but it was repeated.)

Q. Mr. Witness, I repeat, did not your Church—did not Alexander Campbell, or the Campbells, teach, as a doctrine of your Church originally, that baptism and regeneration are synonymous?

A. Never, as you interpret it; nor has it been so accepted by the Church.

Q. Mr. Witness, is the following the enunciation of orthodox doctrine: "As regeneration is being born again, we wish to examine faith and immersion as given in the commission. Regeneration, then, is being born again"?

A. It is the enunciation of orthodoxy in the view of the case which he is there examining. If you mean to say that it is to be understood as baptismal regeneration, then we do not accept it.

Q. I repeat again, are not immersion and regeneration considered as synonymous in that passage?

A. No, sir; immersion is not fully the equivalent of regeneration.

Q. Did not Campbell so teach?

A. No, sir; he did not so teach.

Q. You know Campbell's works, do you not?

A. I do.

Q. Well, now, I will ask you, did not Campbell teach that baptism, repentance and those other things commanded in the commission, were saving ordinances?

A. He did. He would have violated the Scriptures had he taught otherwise.

Q. Did he not teach that immersion is the only proper form of baptism?

A. He did.

Q. Now, are not the doctrines which he stated the teachings of your Church to-day?

A. They are, in the main, I am proud to say.

Q. Was it not the doctrine of your Church that baptism is essential to salvation; that is, that a man can not be saved without he believes and is immersed?

A. No, it is not, when speaking absolutely.

Q. You announce that your Church does not believe that?

A. No, sir; I did not say that the Church does not teach the duty of baptism.

Q. What, then, do you mean when you say that you believe that baptism is a saving ordinance?

A. It is that baptism is the final act—it initiates a man into the kingdom of Christ; but the Christian Church does not believe, nor does it preach, the doctrine that a man is saved simply by baptism; that a pious life is not to follow.

Q. Mr. Witness, if a man can be saved without baptism, is it not a misnomer to call it a saving ordinance?

A. No, sir; because it is the fundamental doctrine of orthodoxy. John Wesley taught that no man can receive salvation, except through baptism; and John Calvin swings the eternal decrees of election on its hinges.

Q. I repeat my question: If a man can be saved without it, is it a saving ordinance at all?

A. Yes; for the reason that there are extraordinary circumstances in which a person can not be baptized. But baptism is a commandment; and, if a man can obey a commandment, yet will not do so, the gospel reveals no way by which the willfully disobedient can be saved.

Q. Did I understand you to say that Luther taught transubstantation as being essential to orthodoxy?

A. No, sir; I said that he seemed to accept the doctrine.

Q. Is it not a fact that Luther's predecessors, and Luther himself, rejected it; and was there not a good deal of discussion over it?

A. Yes, sir; and when Mr. Luther had his celebrated discussion with Zwingli, he declared that the bread and wine were the body and blood of Christ; Luther took the red cloth and shook it in the face of Zwingli, and declared that the bread and wine were actually transformed into the body

and blood of Christ; and, throwing the cloth down on the table, turned and left the discussion.

Q. Yes, sir, that is true; but Luther maintained that the only efficacy there is in the bread and wine is in the manner in which it is taken.

A. Yes.

Q. Has not the doctrine taught by the Roman Catholic Church on transubstantiation been rejected by the Lutherans?

A. I might state that, theologically, Martin Luther positively renounced the Roman Catholic doctrine of transubstantiation; but he believed, at the same time, that there was a mysterious efficacy in the bread and wine.

Q. Is not that held to-day?

A. Some churches hold it.

Q. Then I repeat my question, Has there been no substantial change in the doctrine of your Church since the beginning?

A. No, sir; we accept the Scriptures to-day, and always did.

Q. Has not the doctrine of your Church, as well as the doctrines of the other churches, changed somewhat?

A. There are certain changes going on in all the churches.

Q. Has the test of orthodoxy been at all over these accepted doctrines?

A. Yes, sir; the contest, ever since the year 1825, has been over the first of these doctrines.

Q. As they are held now, are the doctrines of your Church changed with reference to the Trinity?

A. I do not think there is any change in the substantial points.

Q. You call your Church "reformed"—you say it is not sectarian. Will you tell the jury briefly some of the points wherein it is different from the Baptist Church at this time?

(This question was withdrawn.)

Q. You call your Church "the Reformation." The gist of my question is, What do you mean by that?

A. When Martin Luther left the Roman Catholic Church, he made the distinction which exists to-day between the Roman Catholic Church and the Protestants; and, ever since that time, the tendency has been to get back to the practice of the apostles. After Luther came the movement under John Calvin and John Knox; and after them came the movement under the Wesleys: in both of these movements important elements of the apostolic practice were brought to the front. When we speak in theology of these movements, we speak of them as "reformations;" and ours, as the last movement in that direction, is called "the current Reformation."

Q. You say that you mention that as being the Reformation?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. What is the doctrine of your Church with reference to the influence of the Holy Spirit in conversion?

A. It is that the Holy Spirit is the agent of God in producing conversion.

Q. What evidence is there of its being exerted on any person in conversion?

A. That is a matter which I do not think any doctor of divinity has ever been able to state explicitly.

Q. Did Mr. Campbell state it?

A. I do not think he did explicitly, except that the gospel is the Spirit's instrument.

Q. I will read, Mr. Witness, and ask you if you agree with this statement of the influence of the Holy Spirit: "The Spirit is the main agency of God in conversion"—is that a correct statement of the workings of the Holy Spirit in conversion?

A. Yes, sir, it is.

Q. Is that theory accepted as orthodox?

A. It is orthodox. It teaches us that it is the power of God, through the gospel, in producing the conversion and sanctification of the sinner.

Q. Has the doctrine of your Church changed any since the announcement of it by Mr. Campbell?

(To this question objection was made, but the witness answered.)

A. Well, I might properly say that there has been no change of doctrine.

Q. Well, Mr. Witness, have you not stated that it was changed?

A. With reference to that, I would say that every statement which Mr. Campbell has given which is scriptural we accept. I would not state that we accept everything he taught; because he was only a man, and not divine. We do not accept teachings because Mr. Campbell gave them.

Q. Well, I will ask you if you have not accepted everything he has said on any one subject?

A. No, sir.

Q. I will ask you if your Church teaches at the present time that there is any influence of the Spirit exerted on the heart of a man only as it is assisted by the Divine Word?

A. The Spirit works through His Word.

Q. That is not an answer to the question. Now, sir, I will ask you what you think of this doctrine—whether you consider it to be orthodox or not: "It is maintained that the Holy Spirit, in the conversion of any man, is confined to the arguments, persuasions and inducements that are set forth in the written Word." Is that true orthodox doctrine as stated?

A. I think it is hardly orthodox doctrine—I think it is a correct opinion.

Q. I will read further. Is this correct: "Evident, then, it is from this fact, which, I presume, I may also call an incontrovertible fact, that no light is communicated by the Holy Spirit, in regenerating and converting men; which is equivalent to saying that 'in conversion and sanctification the Spirit of God operates only through the Word of Truth'"? I ask you, is that the opinion held by your Church at the present time upon that subject?

A Well, sir, they are divided upon that. There are people in the Church who believe in what is known as the direct operation of the Spirit upon the heart of the sinner; and there are those who do not accept it, but who do accept the direct operation of the Spirit upon the heart of the Christian. As these things pertain to the work of the Spirit, for the doing or not doing of which men are in no way responsible (this pertains to the Spirit alone), they are held as matters of opinion, in which the widest latitude is granted.

Q. Then, I will read this and ask you whether or not it is the doctrine of the Church: "It is maintained that there is an influence of the Holy Spirit exercised in conversion, that it operates upon the mind of the sinner." Is that true orthodox doctrine? Is that accepted in your Church as orthodox doctrine? Would you call it so?

A. It is orthodox doctrine, so-called.

Q. Well, I will repeat the question, Is it expounded as true doctrine by your Church?

A. Well, I will have to answer that in the same way I answered your question a few moments ago.

Q. How is that?

A. That there is a difference of opinion in the Church. Please understand that these questions are not orthodox. There is no command resting on these points, and every one may have his opinion.

Q. I will read: "In the New Testament we are informed that men were to be sanctified through the truth—that God's Word is truth; that the Spirit is called the Spirit of truth; and, hence, for these reasons, we are to look for the power of the Holy Spirit, as applied to a man's heart, in the Word of truth, and when this has been fully received and its power exercised a man will be sanctified—sanctified through the truth." Does your Church accept that doctrine?

A. It accepts that, in all that it imports.

Q. What do you mean by that: that "it accepts that, in all that it imports"?

A. That there is implied, and that there must be, an obedience to the Word.

Q. I would like to ask you, does your Church accept the doctrine that Christ possessed more than ordinary power?

(To this question objection was made, but it was answered.)

A. It does. I would say that He was offered as a sacrifice for the sins of men.

Q. Well, was He, in the highest sense, possessed of the dignity of a holy, sacred and creative being?

A. He was, in the very highest sense, possessed of the dignity of a holy, sacred and creative being.

Q. I will ask you if this doctrine is accepted by your Church as it is related to the Trinity.

A. It is, in regard to the Trinity.

Q. What is the doctrine of your Church, as you understand it, in respect to the question I asked you?

A. That the divinity of Christ is uncreated; that He indeed is the Creator; but that his humanity was created.

Q. Christ was not wholly uncreated, then?

A. No, not wholly uncreated, because His manhood was created; His divinity was not created.

Q. Now, is the divinity of the Holy Spirit, as a doctrine, accepted by your Church?

(To this question objection was made, but it was answered.)

A. It is accepted that the Holy Spirit is a personage, and that it is one of the substantial parts of the Divine Being.

Q. Well, I want to ask you, what is meant by that?

A. The personage of the Holy Spirit?

Q. Yes. What is the Holy Spirit? Is it equal with God? Is it a part of the Godhead, according to the doctrine accepted by your Church? Does it teach so?

A. As to a belief of the doctrine as taught since the days of the apostles, I desire to refer to the Presbyterian Confession of Faith, if you please.

(The counsel handed the witness a book.)

Q. Mr. Witness, what book have you in your hand?

A. I have the Confession of Faith of the Presbyterian Church.

Q. Do you propose to read from the book?

A. No, sir; what I wanted the book for is to look at the quotation of a passage of Scripture concerning the Trinity.

Q. You were asked a moment ago, What is the doctrine of the Holy Spirit, as it is accepted by your Church?

A. That it is one of the three beings known as the Trinity; for the Apostle says: "There are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one." (I. John v. 7.)

Q. I will ask you whether or not it is a part of the Divine Being? Is it a part of the Godhead itself?

A. It is a part of the Godhead; but whether or not the Spirit is different as to form from the Godhead, in the way the question is meant, I can not answer. I do not believe there is a universally accepted belief in the Christian Church upon that particular statement.

Q. Well, I will ask you, does your Church have any accepted doctrine upon the subject?

A. Yes, sir; it has.

Q. State whether or not the Holy Spirit is from God.

A. Well, I rather think that the Bible teaches that the Spirit proceeds from God.

Q. Then, if I understand you, your Church are not united upon that?

A. Well, if you understand me, it accepts that as to there being three personages in the Godhead; but as to the phraseology in expressing that, there may be a difference.

Q. In other words, it is the same name as that of the Father?

A. In one sense, it might be so used.

Q. By a certain figure of speech, the name, in its signification, means "deity," so far as power is concerned?

A. It takes the three to make up the Godhead, and they are the same, so far as power is concerned.

Q. Then you are not prepared to announce, as the doctrine of your Church, that the Holy Ghost is the Spirit of God, in the highest sense of that term?

A. I am prepared to announce that the Holy Ghost is the Spirit of God, in the highest sense of that term.

Q. What does your Church accept as the meaning of the true Trinity?

A. The union of three Divine Personages in one.

Q. Yes, sir. Well, can you define the word "personage"?

A. Well, I think it is assumed as representing character.

Q. Will you define what is meant by the word "trinity"?

A. I understand it to be the union of three in one.

Q. Can you tell me which personage in the Trinity is defined to be eternal and uncreated?

A. No, sir; I do not know that I can say which one is defined to be eternal and uncreated.

Q. You can state the doctrines of your Church, can you not?

A. I can.

Q. Do I understand you to say that the Scriptures have no teaching on the point as to whether or not the Holy Spirit is a part of God?

A. No, sir. What I said was that the Scriptures have no precise expression setting forth that idea.

Q. Do I understand you to say that the doctrine, or idea, is not taught in the Bible?

A. I do not know how you understand me, but I did not say that the idea is not taught in the Bible.

Q. If it is, then your Church has not so far accepted it?

A. One of us is dull.

Q. What do you say on that subject?

A. I say that the Bible has no precise expression on the Spirit's Godhead. The personal Godhead of the Holy Spirit, as an object of worship, was not announced until the latter part of the fifth century, and this announcement was at the city of Constantinople.

Q. Well, has the Bible any precise idea?

A. I think it has.

Q. Then, will you answer my question? If the Bible has taught the doctrine, has your Church accepted it, so far as you know?

A. If the Bible has taught the doctrine, so as to make its belief a matter necessary to salvation, the Church has not accepted it; but the question concludes against one and is unfair. The Bible does not teach the doctrine as necessary to salvation.

Q. What is the doctrine of your Church with reference to the so-called fall of man?

A. It teaches that in the transgression of Adam sin entered into the world, and death by sin; that all men are under the condemnation, for that all have sinned; and that, as set forth by the apostle, an atoning sacrifice is necessary, in consequence of these things, for the redemption of the human family.

Q. What is original sin, as the doctrine is accepted by your Church?

(To this question objection was made, but it was answered.)

A. Original sin is whatever of disposition to evil men may have inherited in consequence of sin coming into the world.

Q. Does it bear any relation to the sin of Adam?

A. The sin of Adam is reputed to be its father.

Q. Well, what do you mean when you say "father"?

A. That sin entered the world with Adam's sin.

Q. Is that an accepted doctrine?

A. I think that it is accepted by all the Christian churches.

Q. Can there be such a thing as imputed sin?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Well, has the existence of sin to-day any connection with the sin of Adam?

A. Yes, sir; because of the Adamic transgression, and the circumstances following, man was left in a more exposed condition to sin. Every conflict and struggle in life may increase one's liability to do wrong: for with each recurring one there comes a new presenting of right and wrong

before him, and as the number increases the liability increases also. So the existence of sin to-day is connected with the sin of Adam through the sinful circumstances and conditions which followed that sin.

Q. I will ask you, what is the doctrine in your Church as to imputed sin? Explain as near as you can.

A. I can explain only by stating that when Adam was given his existence in the world, he sinned; and, falling under the condemnation of the divine law with all that that condemnation meant, therefore a sacrifice for sin became necessary.

Q. Now, you have stated something heretofore about certain doctrines; I would like to ask you to state briefly what the doctrines are which determine whether or not a church is orthodox.

A. There are an acceptance of the gospel of Christ as divinely given and obligatory, faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, repentance, and baptism. These are essential to orthodoxy, for by them we come into Christ.

Q. Can you give an illustration? What are the teachings of the Presbyterian Church as to foreordination and predestination? Are these accepted?

A. No, sir; the Presbyterian Church, as I understand it, does not to-day enforce those teachings. They are dead doctrines in a living creed.

Q. You stated that the orthodox churches believe in the operation of the Holy Spirit on the hearts of sinful men?

A. No, sir; I did not say that.

Q. What did you say?

A. I said that the offering of Christ was equally for all.

Q. What did you say upon that subject?

A. As essential to orthodoxy, I believe in the doctrine of the offering of Christ.

Q. Define it. Please state something as to that.

A. God sent the Saviour into the world to be offered as a propitiatory sacrifice. His gospel privileges are free to all—to all persons, either to be received or rejected.

Q. And the Holy Spirit has no effect, to any extent, on persons, one way or the other?

A. I do not so understand it. It has an effect.

Q. What has it to do with the doctrines of the Church?

A. There appears to be a good deal of doctrine upon that subject. The effect which the gospel has over the hearts of men is potent. The Apostle says it is the power of God unto salvation.

Q. Just one word further: If a man accept generally the doctrines of your Church, and does not believe in the divinity of Jesus Christ, nor that *all* the things related in the Bible are true—would that act as a debarment to membership in it?

A. He could not enter the Church without such faith.

Re-Direct Examination by the Counsel for the Plaintiff.

Q. I want to call your attention to one or two propositions. You have spoken of the Trinity, stating that the Christian Church accepts the Trinity, but repudiates certain phraseology; what do you mean by that?

A. I mean by that that the formulated statements of the Trinity are not scriptural. Whether they are true in fact, is another question. The simplest and best statement of the Trinity is that one which says, "There are three which bear record in heaven, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost; and these three are one."

Q. Well, do you believe and teach this statement: "God the Father"?

A. Yes, sir. The Bible continually uses the terms "Father" and "God" interchangeably. It is correct to say, "God the Father."

Q. Is it correct—that is, do you believe and teach this statement: "God the Son"? *A.* We do. John says, "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God." Then the prophet says, "For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given: and the government shall be upon his shoulder: and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace." And the Apostle says that Jesus "thought it not robbery to be equal with God." We do believe that. *Q.* Do you believe and teach this: "God the Holy Ghost"? *A.* No, sir. *Q.* Why? *A.* Because there is no such statement in the Bible. *Q.* Well, this one: "The Holy Ghost is the very and eternal God"? *A.* No, sir. *Q.* Why? *A.* Because there is no such statement in the word of God. *Q.* But may it not be a proper construction from what is said in the word of God? *A.* No, sir; by no means. No such construction should ever be placed, by the teachings of a church, upon anything in the Bible. Constructions upon the Bible—being wise above all that which is written—have desolated the church these fifteen hundred years. The Bible contains what the apostles and divinely inspired writers said upon those points; it is our duty, when we speak as a Church of God, to speak their speech. This is right procedure. It can not be wrong. *Q.* Do I understand you to state that the procedure which you have outlined here, as the position of the Christian Church, is the proper one for a church to take? *A.* This unswerving adherence to the exact forms of gospel statement, and this Acts-of-Apostles style of obedience, is pure Christianity. It is safe, infallibly safe. *Q.* Orthodox? *A.* Divinely orthodox. *Q.* That is all.*

* Some of the testimony having inadvertently been omitted, in preparing the plates, we have been compelled to use this condensed style, in order to restore it.—PUB.

CHAPTER VII.

SECTION IV.

TESTIMONY OF GEORGE W. CHAPMAN.

Mr. Chapman, a witness in behalf of the plaintiff, being duly sworn, testified as follows:

Direct Examination by the Counsel for the Plaintiff.

Q. Will you state your name to the court and jury?

A. George W. Chapman.

Q. Mr. Chapman, where do you reside?

A. I reside in Ligonier, Indiana.

Q. How long have you resided in Ligonier?

A. About eighteen years.

Q. State what church you are a member of, if of any.

A. I am a member of the Christian Church in Ligonier.

Q. How long have you been a member of that Church?

A. I have been a member of that Church about sixteen years; that is, of the congregation in Ligonier.

Q. Yes, sir. How long have you been a member of that branch of the Church designated as the Christian Church?

A. Since the year 1845.

Q. You may state to the jury whether or not you are acquainted with the teaching of that Church in matters of belief.

A. Well, I think I am pretty well acquainted with the theory and practice.

Q. What work of faith and practice contains the doctrine of that Church?

A. "The Bible, the whole Bible, and nothing but the Bible," so far as I understand it.

Q. What is the belief of that Church in regard to the inspiration of the Bible?

A. The belief is that it is inspired of God. The following Scripture expresses the belief of the Church: "God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son."

Q. State whether or not the Christian Church accepts this as a true statement of belief: "I believe in God the Father, Maker of heaven and earth."

A. State your question a little louder, please.

Q. State whether or not the Christian Church accepts this as being a true statement of belief: "I believe in God the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth."

A. I believe that, and I think all the members of the Church do.

Q. State whether or not the Christian Church believes this doctrine: "I believe in Jesus Christ, his only Son, our Lord: who was begotten by the Holy Ghost; born of the Virgin Mary; suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, dead and buried; he descended into hell, the third day he rose from the dead; he ascended into heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of God the Father Almighty; from thence he shall come to judge the quick and the dead."

A. I do; and I have reason to think it does.

Q. State whether or not the Christian Church believes this doctrine: "I believe the Lord Jesus Christ was with the Father from eternity, that he ascended from the dead and lives through eternity." Do you believe that?

A. I believe that, too, and I think it does.

Q. Do you believe this proposition: "I believe in the Holy Ghost, the holy Catholic Church, the communion of saints, the forgiveness of sins, the resurrection of the body, and the life everlasting"?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. You may state, Mr. Chapman, whether or not the doctrines of your Church are in harmony with the doctrines of other denominations that are orthodox upon the essential points of salvation.

(To this question objection was made.)

Q. You may state whether or not the Christian Church is an orthodox denomination.

A. Well, I would like to make this statement before I answer that question: A celebrated Scotch divine once said, "Orthodoxy is my 'doxy,' and heterodoxy is your 'doxy.'" There are two or three ways to answer your question. If it implies whether it is orthodox or heterodox, I would say it is orthodox.

Q. You would say it is orthodox?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Does your Church believe in the doctrine of the Trinity?

A. So far as I understand it, I believe it does. I do not pretend to be acquainted with the meaning of these different expressions.

Q. How many personal manifestations of the Deity, or Godhead, are there?

A. Three.

Q. What are they?

A. The Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit.

Q. Does the Christian Church, or does it not, believe that in the Deity, or Godhead, there are three distinct personages, the same in essence, power, and glory?

A. I understand the Church to believe that there are three distinct personalities. In the Old Testament, these are known as God, the Word of God, and the Spirit of God. In the New Testament dispensation, it is God, Son of God, and the Holy Spirit.

Cross-Examination by the Counsel for the Defendant.

Q. Well, Mr. Witness, you say that you are not very conversant with the doctrine of your Church—did I understand you to say that?

A. Well, I am tolerably conversant with it, but not as much as some others.

Q. Do you know it to be a fact that your Church believes there are three personages in the Trinity?

A. How?

Q. Do you know it to be a fact that your Church believes that there are three personages in the Trinity?

A. If there be a Trinity at all, and if it believes it, it must. I think there are; and I think the Church does, as I understand it.

Q. What your Church believes is not what you may think. Do you know that your Church believes it?

A. Well, I can say that the congregation to which I belong believes it—I know it believes there are three personages in the Trinity; and I think it is the general belief.

Q. It is not what you may think you know of the belief of the Christian Church I want, but what the belief of the Church upon this subject really is.

A. I can not speak for the whole Church as to its belief as related to the different denominations; but I can say for myself that the congregation to which I belong believes in the Father, and in the Son, and in the Holy Spirit.

Q. The congregation to which you belong?

A. The congregation of which I am a member.

Q. Then you pretend to speak for the believers at Salem?

A. At Ligonier.

Q. At Ligonier?

A. I do not know that they teach any thing upon the subject at Salem; there is no such thing as the Salem Christian Church.

Q. Where is the church that is interested in this matter? Is it the church in Ligonier?

A. No; and I do not know, so far as I understand it, that the members of our congregation out there are; but the preacher was allowed to go out there, though.

Q. Did you know that the preacher was employed to go out there and preach?

A. It was by persons living on the Haw-Patch, and not by our members.

Q. You do not know whether the preacher received any thing from the Church for going to the Haw-Patch?

A. Well, I have done what I could.

Q. Certainly. I am not speaking of any one of them. Now, you say that the Church in Ligonier believes that there are three personages in the Trinity?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Then there are God the Father, and God the Son, and God the Holy Spirit?

A. Yes, sir; though there is no Scripture for the last statement, God

Q. Father, Son, and Holy Spirit? [the Holy Spirit.

A. Yes, sir. The Spirit is defined to be one of the personages in the Godhead.

Q. Yes, sir; and I want to know if there can be two other personages at the same time.

A. How?

Q. Can there be two personages at the same time, and acting in different respects?

(To this question objection was made.)

Q. Mr. Witness, I will ask you if you know it to be true that there are three personages in the Godhead?

A. In the Scriptures we read of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit.

Q. Do you say there are three Gods—God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost?

A. I will explain what I mean by the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit. I will read from the Scriptures what they say as to the deity of the Son: "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God. All things were made by him; and without him was not anything made that was made. . . . And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, (and we beheld his glory, as the glory of the only begotten of the Father), full of grace and truth." (John i. 1–3, 14.)

Q. You can state whether or not you regard it as such.

A. Now, I do not want to be understood to say that there are three Gods. I want to be understood to say that there are three distinct intelligences united as one Godhead. Being thus united, as explained, there are three manifestations of the Divine Nature.

Q. Do you want to be understood to say that there are three personages?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. The Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit are the personages, are they?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Three distinct and separate personages?

A. Three distinct and separate personages.

Q. Each a distinct personage unto himself?

A. Well, you may put whatever construction upon it you please.

Q. Then you would not say that they are one being?

A. No, sir.

Q. Are the Holy Spirit and the Son one?

A. Well, I will read—I will quote the Scriptures. You can tell what the belief is, so far as that is concerned, by what they say: "For God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life." (John iii. 16.) This Son said to the disciples, in respect to everlasting life: "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned." (Mark xvi. 15, 16.) The Apostle John, speaking of the purpose of his gospel, says: "Many other signs truly did Jesus in the presence of his disciples, which are not written in this book. But these are written, that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye might have life through his name." (John xx. 30, 31.) Of the Spirit Jesus says: "Nevertheless, I tell you the truth; it is expedient for you that I go away: for if I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart, I will send him unto you. And when He is come, he will reprove the world of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment: of sin, because they believe not on me; of righteousness, because I go to my Father, and ye see me no more; of judgment, because the prince of this world is judged. I have yet many things to say to you, but ye can not bear them now; howbeit, when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth." (John xvi. 7–13.) Here you have what the Scriptures say as to the respective work of the three manifestations of the Divine Nature in the salvation of men, and what the Christian Church believes in respect to them.

Q. I will ask, Mr. Witness, if your Church accepts this doctrine of three distinct personages in the Trinity, God the Father, and God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost?

A. Yes, sir; with the exception noted before.

Q. Three distinct and separate personages?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do you tell the jury that that is the doctrine of your Church?

A. In fact, I do not say another word about it; there is the word of God: "The wayfaring men, though fools, shall not err therein."

Q. That is very good doctrine; so is the Declaration of Independence.

A. The Bible says that he that receives the Son, receives the Father also.

Q. I will ask you, What is the fact as to the doctrine you have announced being the doctrine of the Church at Ligonier?

A. It is the doctrine of our Church at Ligonier, so far as I have heard it declared.

Q. As accepted by the members?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Now, Mr. Witness, I understand you to say that some churches are orthodox, and some are heterodox. Do you mean by that that any church which accepts the Bible has a right to put its own belief, or its own construction, upon the Scriptures?

A. I mean that any person has the right to read the Scriptures for himself, and having the right to read, he has the right to interpret, always having in view his responsibility.

Q. Do you mean by this that each person of your Church has the right to put his own construction on the Bible?

A. Each member has a right to put such construction upon the Bible as he may think is correct, always having in view his personal responsibility.

Q. You believe that?

A. I believe it, because that is the way men are to believe: "But these are written, that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ the Son of God; and that believing ye might have life through his name."

Q. But still, so far as the word of God is concerned, each member of your Church has a right to put his own construction upon it, has he not?

A. Yes, sir, he always keeping in view his personal responsibility; as every one has a personal responsibility of his own, no one can interpet for him so as to meet that responsibility; he must meet that himself—others can only help him, teach him.

Q. Then the Church, as a whole, has no doctrine at all?

A. I want to say this, or make this remark, that every person has the

right to read the word of God, or have it truly declared to him, before he believes; and this must be before he obtains faith—the true faith.

Q. He has a right to know?

A. He has a right to know and understand, to be assured that he is right, if he be a responsible person.

Q. So there is, of course, no restraint; but a man may put such construction upon the Bible as he thinks right, and each man may put a different construction upon the Bible?

A. Every man has the right to read the Bible for himself; and there is no more danger of diversity of construction in so doing than there is in reading and interpreting a creed, or other book.

Q. Each one reads the Bible for himself?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And he chooses his own belief?

A. Yes, sir; but they will all come to the same belief if the Bible be read in the same way and for the same purpose—if it be read in view of the personal responsibility of each one.

Q. That is your opinion; but what is the fact in the case as related to your observation in this matter?

A. So far as I have noticed, so far as my observation extends concerning it, that is a matter of fact.

Q. You say, "If they all read it for the same purpose"?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. That is, if the same persons try to believe the same doctrine?

A. Yes, sir: if they try to believe, they will all believe alike; and, if they read ALL that the Bible says upon any one subject, their belief will be correct.

Q. You think that thirty persons in the Christian Church could not believe one way, and ten some other way?

A. No, I do not, under the conditions I have noted.

Q. Pertaining to any one single question, suppose the remaining ten should believe some other way?

A. As to that I want to say, on subjects not necessary to his salvation, when a person reads and he is pursuaded that he is correct, he has a right to his opinion; but to secure his salvation the Scriptures make it imperative that he believe in Christ and obey His commands, and live according to the Scriptures. As Peter says, he must "add to his faith, virtue; and to virtue, knowledge; and to knowledge, temperance; and to temperance, patience; and to patience, godliness; and to godliness, brotherly kindness; and to brotherly kindness, charity. For if these things be in you, and abound, they make you that ye shall neither be barren nor unfruitful in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ." (II. Peter i. 5–8.)

Q. That is very good, but it does not answer my question.

A. One must believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of the living God.

Q. Yes, sir; that is all very good; but I asked you five minutes ago if there were forty persons in a church, whether ten of them could not put one construction upon the Bible, and the remaining thirty another construction?

A. It is possible for forty persons to read the Bible, under circumstances different from what I have stated, and some of them put a different construction upon it from the others; but I think they would all put the same construction upon it, if they did not read to put a different construction upon it.

Q. Well, I want to ask you this question: Does the Church allow a difference of belief on the fundamental doctrines?

A. No; because if they did the Church would not all believe the same thing, and some one's salvation would be imperiled.

Q. I know; but may they not put a different construction on the same words? Is it not a fact that there are a great many different constructions put upon the word "trinity"?

A. There may be, but that is mere speculation.

Q. Well, as to the word "being," are there not a great many different constructions put upon it?

A. I do not know; I presume that different constructions may be placed upon it.

Q. Well, in other words, may there not be different constructions put upon the same manifestations of it?

A. Do you mean the manifestations of true being?

Q. I mean to say, does the Bible not teach, and do not Christians regard it as true, that there are more than one manifestation of the same being?

A. Well, the Bible speaks of the Father and Son; whether it makes the same distinction in any other instance, I do not know.

Q. With reference to the question as to the construction that may be put upon the Bible, you are too remote in your answer. But what do you say with reference to Christian election?

(To this question objection was made.)

Q. What do you say as to the orthodoxy of the different churches?

A. Now, as to the facts of the gospel, the different churches are in harmony, and therefore orthodox. For instance, they all teach that "without faith, it is impossible to please God." This faith, however, gathers about the facts of the gospel, and not about their theoretical and speculative dogmas.

Q. You say that your Church is orthodox. What do you mean by that? What is orthodoxy?

A. I do not know that I can define the term—what I mean by it is that we accept the Scriptures as the word of faith and practice.

Q. Yes, sir; but who is to put such construction upon them as is right when you say that your Church accepts them as the word of faith and practice?

(To this question objection was made.)

Q. What do you mean when you say that your Church is orthodox?

A. I mean that it accepts the teaching of the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as its doctrine.

Q. Is that all you mean?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. The only definition?

A. Yes, sir; that is what I give.

Q. You accept the Scriptures as true?

A. Yes, sir; and of divine origin.

Q. And inspired?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Do n't you know that there are more than one construction put upon the Scriptures?

A. I do not know—I do not know that there are more different constructions put upon the Scriptures, that they are susceptible of more constructions, than are put upon the different human creeds.

Q. Some believe they mean one thing, and some think that another construction ought to be put upon them.

A. Well, I will give you the declaration of the Apostle: "God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son." (Hebrews i. 1, 2.) In that declaration the Apostle affirms that God and His Son have spoken to men. If they can not speak so as to not be justly liable to different constructions, then I despair of such a thing ever being done; much less by assemblies of men which construct creeds, confessions of faith, etc. The causes for the different constructions of the Bible are not in the Bible itself, but in the readers of the Bible.

Q. Now, you call yourselves orthodox because you accept the Scriptures. You know that the Unitarians accept the Scriptures. Are they orthodox?

A. I can 't say.

Q. Mr. Collier accepted the Bible in his arguments. Is he orthodox?

A. I can not tell.

Q. I will ask you this question: Is there any class that accept the

Bible that are not orthodox? The Universalists accept the Bible. Are they orthodox?

A. I can not tell.

Q. Are they in theory? Does the mere acceptance of the Bible make the Universalist Church orthodox?

A. If they have in faith accepted the Bible and practice its teachings, I think they are orthodox. If they have truly accepted the word and practice it, I think they ought not to be excluded. I can understand how many Universalists may be saved, notwithstanding they may train under one false principle; and, if they are saved, they certainly ought to be counted orthodox.

Q. Now, then, if it be correct that the acceptance and belief of the Bible constitutes orthodoxy, then the Unitarians are orthodox.

A. That does not follow from my statement. My statement is this: They are to accept the Bible as the true word of God relating to the salvation of men, and they are to follow its teaching. This will make any one orthodox. I do not care to interfere with what notions men have—I want to be right myself.

Q. Mr. Witness, if your assertion is true that to accept the Bible as the inspired and true word of God, together with following its teaching, constitutes orthodoxy, is not every one who does the same orthodox?

A. I should think so.

Q. Now, if the Unitarians and Universalists profess to accept the Bible as true and to follow its teaching, you would regard them as orthodox, so far as that is concerned?

A. Mere profession would not make them orthodox; but if they really do believe the Bible and follow its teaching, I do not see how they ought to be excluded.

Q. How is that? They would be so considered?

A. If they believe, accept and practice the teaching of the Bible.

Q. If they believe and practice it, you would consider them orthodox?

A. Yes, sir; but I can not tell whether or not they are orthodox, for I do not know what their teachings are.

Q. Well, is there anything else required besides faith in the Bible as the word of God?

A. They must believe in the Bible as the true word of God.

Q. Faith is the one great requirement, and if they believe they are orthodox—is that your answer?

A. They must have faith, or belief, in the Being that created them.

Q. That is what you believe?

A. Yes, sir; that is it exactly.

Q. And that is what you believe is orthodoxy?

A. I think so, because orthodoxy relates to the true teaching of the Scriptures, and I take the Scriptures.

Q. You do n't say that it says so in the Scriptures?

A. So far as I have read them.

Q. Well, Mr. Witness, passing on, I believe I shall ask you to give a direct answer to this question: If the Universalists and Unitarians accept the Bible as inspired, believe and follow its teaching, are they not orthodox?

(To this question objection was made, but it was repeated.)

Q. Now, I will ask you, sir—I say, if the acceptance of the Bible, believing its doctrines and following them—if they believe in these things—if the Universalists accept the Bible, are they not orthodox; if they have faith in it and follow it?

A. If they have faith in it and follow it, I should think so.

Q. Yes, sir. You mean you are orthodox, if you believe?

A. Yes, sir; I do.

Q. Is that orthodoxy, because you believe it?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Merely because you believe it?

A. Yes, sir.

Re-Direct Examination by the Counsel for the Plaintiff.

Q. You were asked, Mr. Chapman, whether or not you believe in three personages in the Godhead. I will ask you to state whether or not these three personages are united in one body—are the persons united in one body?

A. Whether or not the three persons are united in one body, I will not say; but as there is one human nature, and millions of manifestations of it, so there is one Divine nature, and three manifestations of it.

Q. In one Godhead?

A. In one Godhead.

Q. Yes, sir?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Are the personages divine?

A. Yes, sir; that is my idea of it.

Q. Now, Mr. Chapman, in regard to the interpretation of the Scriptures, I will ask you what are the cardinal points deemed essential by the Christian Church?

A. Faith in the Lord Jesus Christ as the Son of God and our Saviour, repentance or turning from sin, confessing the Lord Jesus as the Christ and the Son of the living God, and baptism.

Q. Do you, or do you not, mean to be understood that, if a man

merely says that he believes the Holy Scriptures to be the true word of God, he has a right to put any interpretation, however absurd, upon it?

A. Oh! no, I do not believe that. I believe that he must apply the accepted rules of interpretation. For instance, if a man says with his lips that he believes the Scriptures to be the word of the living God, and denies their teachings in his practical life, I do not think he ought to be admissible to the Church—I do not think he is orthodox.

Q. That is all.

CHAPTER VIII.

SECTION V.

TESTIMONY OF L. L. CARPENTER.

L. L. Carpenter, a witness in behalf of the plaintiff, being duly sworn, testified as follows:

Examination in Chief.

Q. Will you please state your name to the court and jury?

A. My name is L. L. Carpenter.

Q. Where do you reside, Mr. Carpenter?

A. I reside in Wabash town, Wabash county, Indiana.

Q. Are you a member of any Protestant religious church?

A. I am.

Q. Of what church are you a member?

A. I am a member of the Church commonly known as the Christian Church.

Q. How long have you been a member of that Church?

A. It will be thirty years the 16th day of next August, since I became a member of the Christian Church.

Q. You may state, sir, what relation you sustain to that Church?

A. At present I am what is known among our people as the State Evangelist—an evangelist appointed by our State Sunday-school Association.

Q. What relation to the Church have you held in the past?

A. I have been for the past twenty-six years a recognized preacher in the Church, and for twelve years of this time I have held the position of State Evangelist by the appointment of either the State Missionary Association or of the State Sunday-school Association.

Q. At what points have you served as a minister, or preacher?

A. I have served as such at Wabash. That is where I live; I have lived there for thirteen years. I was pastor of our Church at Fort Wayne at one time. In my evangelistic work as State Evangelist, I have preached in almost every part of the State of Indiana. I have also been a pastor in Ohio, preaching at Wauseon and Moscow, and in the country adjacent to them.

Q. What is the membership of the Christian Church in the State of Indiana?

(To this question objection was made.)

Q. You may state, Mr. Witness, whether or not you are acquainted with the recognized doctrines or teaching of the Christian Church in this State, and throughout the United States?

A. I suppose that I am. I have been identified with it as I have said: and I have been a careful student of its teachings and a practical worker in their dissemination. I suppose I can say I am acquainted with its teaching.

Q. You may state, if you please, what the rule of faith and practice is in the Christian Church.

A. The Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments are accepted as the only rule of faith and practice by the Church.

Q. Do you accept the Scriptures as being inspired, or only as being of human origin?

A. We accept them as being inspired by the Holy Spirit, as being the revelation which God has given men of Himself and His will through the Holy Spirit.

Q. You may state, sir, whether there be a written, printed or formulated creed, or doctrine, which has been recognized as such by the Church.

A. The Church has no written, or printed or formulated creed, except the Bible—it takes the Bible only as its rule of faith and practice, and every person has the right to read the Bible for himself.

Q. You may state, if you please, sir, what the cardinal doctrines of the Christian Church, of which you are a member, are.

A. Well, sir, I will restate what I have already said, that the Church accepts the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as its only rule of faith and practice; and it regards them as the only authority in determining the matters of salvation. The doctrine of the Scriptures is the doctrine of the Christian Church.

Q. I will ask you this: Are the statements of the doctrines of the Christian Church orthodox? I mean by my question, whether or not the Christian Church, of which you have been speaking, is an orthodox denomination.

A. Of course, if I answer that question from my standpoint, I must say I think it is, sir. If I did not think so, I would not be identified with it.

Q. You may now state what the doctrines are which are taught by the Church as requisite or essential to the admission of members into the Church.

A. The Church believes and teaches that, in becoming a member of

the Church, an individual must be regenerated, or born again; just as the Saviour taught Nicodemus: "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, except a man be born again, he can not see the kingdom of God. Nicodemus saith unto him, How can a man be born when he is old? Can he enter the second time into his mother's womb and be born? Jesus answered, Verily, verily, I say unto thee, except a man be born of the water and of the Spirit, he can not enter into the kingdom of God." (John iii. 3–5.) To specify what the Saviour is understood to have meant by being "born again," I may state that the Church believes and teaches that men, in their unconverted state, are sinners, and that they are not able to save themselves from their sins; that the Lord Jesus Christ, in His propitiation for the sins of the world, made provisions for their salvation, and consequently that He was offered as a sacrifice for sins; that men are to be saved through the efficacy of His blood; that "the blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin." In receiving the blessings of the applied blood of Jesus Christ in being cleansed from all sin, the Church believes and teaches that there is, as the Saviour says, a process of being born again; that in this process of being born again there is first the being begotten by the Word of truth through the Spirit, which induces belief in Jesus as the Son of God, and produces trust in Him as the Saviour of men, then the growth of this living principle until it produces a repentance of sin (a turning to a reformed life) and a confession before men of Jesus as the Son of God, then a baptism into the name of the Father, and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit,—which is the consummating act in the process of being born again, the being "born of water." Now, when an individual is thus born again of the water and the Spirit, the Church believes and teaches that he is born into the family of God (which is but another name for the Church), and that, therefore, he becomes a member of the Church of Christ. Of course, after thus being born into the household of faith, the Church believes and teaches that he must live a Christian life, he must continue steadfast, in order to obtain the final and great salvation in heaven.

Q. What do you mean by continuing steadfast?

A. Well, I mean continuing to live a Christian life.

Q. What must be observed in order to do that?

A. The Church regards a great many things as necessary; perhaps this statement will cover the whole ground: "And they continued steadfastly in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in prayers." (Acts ii. 42.) This is understood to cover the whole ground of Christian duty.

Q. You may state, sir, whether or not the doctrines taught by the Christian Church as being essential to entitle one to an admission into the Church of Christ are, in substance, the recognized theological doctrines of the Protestant Christian churches of the present age.

A. I think there is a great similarity in the teachings of the Christian Church as to what is necessary to salvation, to that taught by the other denominations. I mean by this that the essential requirements of salvation, as set forth by the Christian Church, are accepted by all Protestant Christians everywhere, in that they will admit, if those requirements are faithfully observed, are obeyed with a true heart, that the party so doing is entitled to salvation under the promises of the gospel.

Q. You may state in what manner baptism is practiced by the Christian Church.

A. It is by immersion—immersion of the penitent believer in water, upon confession of his faith in the Lord Jesus Christ as the Son of God.

Q. Does the Church believe the teaching that immersion alone, immersion without faith, without repentance, without confession, avails anything to the salvation of the soul?

A. No, sir; it believes and teaches that it would be blasphemy before God.

Q. You may state whether or not the Christian Church believes and teaches, as a Church, that a person who has faith in Jesus Christ as the Son of the living God—who believes upon Him, repents of his sins, and confesses Him before men, but who thinks that baptism may be performed by sprinkling or immersion either—would he be lost, or would he be saved?

A. The Christian Church does not make any attempt to enter the secret chambers of the Most High and declare what God must do in all the exigencies of human life;—it is my own opinion that there are some persons, under the conditions stated, who may be saved;—but it does insist upon it that it is by all odds the safest thing to be baptized in that way which has been during all the Christian era, and is now by all Christians, admitted to be baptism. In its work for the salvation of men, it wants to take no chances; nor by its example to induce others to do so.

Q. Then it is not in the rite of baptism that the distinction is made; but it is somewhat in the manner in which it is administered?

A. The Christian Church believes that only immersion is baptism, and that in this way the command in respect to it is to be obeyed.

Q. Then, as a rite, does it differ from the so-called orthodox conception of baptism, as taught by the Christian Church?

A. The Christian Church believes and teaches that there is no efficacy in the simple act of baptism, that it alone should be made necessary to salvation. It becomes necessary because it is one of the commandments of the Lord Jesus Christ; but the efficacy to save from sin is in the blood of Christ, which is appropriated and applied to the conscience by obedience to His commands.

Q. Is baptism the initiatory step?

A. It is held that, as related to the process of being born again, it is the consummating act; but, as it is related to the Church of Christ, it is what may be called the initiatory step by which one enters the Church—just as the birth is the consummating act of being born, and at the same time the means by which the child enters and becomes a part of the family.

Q. Do I understand you to mean that this identifies him with the Church?

A. I mean that just as the act of birth identifies the child with the family, so does the consummating act in being born again identify an individual with the Church of the Living God. It is at the consummation of the new birth that the forgiveness of sins is granted, according to the purpose of repentance and baptism as expressed by the Apostle Peter: "Repent and be baptized every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." (Acts ii. 38.)

Q. It would be, then, an act of external recognition?

A. It would be an external act of recognition.

Q. You may state what the doctrines, or teachings of the Christian Church are upon the subject of the Trinity?

A. We believe in God, and recognize a plurality, a trinity, in the Godhead, as I think it is usually received by the religious world; that is, the Church believes in the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit, but at the same time leaves all formulation of these ineffably grand conceptions of the Deity to the form of the Scripture statement: "There are three that bear record in heaven: the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one." (I. John v. 7.)

Q. What is the character of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, as compared with each other?

A. It is believed that they are one and equal; at least this is asserted, in the Scriptures, of the Father and the Son.

Q. One in substance?

A. Probably one in substance.

Q. You may state whether or not the Christian Church, of which you have been speaking, is admitted into the Evangelical Alliance?

(To this question objection was made.)

Q. (By the Court), What is the Evangelical Alliance composed of? what constitutes it?

A. Well, sir, I do not know that I can answer that question fully. As I understand it, it is an association, a religious organization, composed of religious people of the various different churches, to advance the common interests of Christianity.

Q. Is orthodoxy essential to admission into the Evangelical Alliance?

A. I can not say as to whether so-called orthodoxy is essential to admission into the Alliance or not; they probably have a statement, similar to the one set forth by the Young Men's Christian Association, defining the term "evangelical," to which assent is required.

Q. What is the statement of the Young Men's Christian Association, to which you refer?

A. As well as I remember, it is this [the editor has taken the liberty to give this statement correctly]: "And we hold those churches to be evangelical which, maintaining the Holy Scriptures to be the only infallible rule of faith and practice, do believe in the Lord Jesus Christ (the only begotten of the Father, King of kings, and Lord of lords, in whom dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead bodily, and who was made sin for us, though knowing no sin, bearing our sins in His own body on the tree) as the only name under heaven whereby we must be saved from everlasting punishment." (*Constitution Y. M. C. A.*)

Q. What is the difference, if any, in the application by the various religious denominations of the two terms—"evangelical" and "orthodox"?

(To this question objection was made, but it was answered.)

A. My own judgment is that members who are not orthodox are not evangelical. I think that evangelical people are orthodox, and that orthodox people are evangelical.

Q. Now, if I understand you, you have stated that when any religious denomination is admitted into the Evangelical Alliance, it must be either orthodox or evangelical?

(To this question objection was made.)

Q. Do you know what constitutes the membership of the Evangelical Alliance?

A. I do not know the number of churches having membership in the Alliance; but I understand that a church, to be recognized, must be a so-called orthodox or evangelical church—this is my understanding.

Q. I will ask you to state what your knowledge is as to the Unitarian Church being admitted or excluded from it.

A. I have never known members of that Church to be admitted myself; my understanding is that they are not admitted.

Q. (By the Court). You understand evangelical and orthodox to be synonymous terms?

A. As I understand it, an evangelical church would be recognized as an orthodox one.

Q. Are these terms used in that sense by the Evangelical Alliance?

A. I can not answer for the Evangelical Alliance.

Q. I mean the organizations, the churches connected with it.

A. I think they are—that would be my opinion.

Q. I will ask you, Mr. Witness, whether or not the Disciples' Church, or Christian Church, has been recognized so that its members are admitted to membership by the Evangelical Alliance?

A. My understanding is that it has been.

Q. You may state what the Methodist Episcopal, the Presbyterian, and orther churches, do in the way of recognizing you.

A. I have always been admitted, and there has never been any objection on the part of any one, to their conventions, associations, presbyteries, conferences, etc., where I have happened to go, just as the ministers of the other churches were admitted, having frequently had the honor conferred upon me of visiting member of the convention by its own vote, and invited to take part with them in their deliberations.

Q. Do you mean by this admission to their conventions, etc., that you received a personal courtesy, or was it on account of your Church?

A. What these conventions intended by these acts of courtesy, I would not say; but in the arrangements for the Week of Prayer where I have labored, which was arranged for and carried out under the suggestion and direction of the Evangelical Alliance, I and my Church have been treated just as the other pastors and churches—there has been no difference.

Q. You were speaking with reference to the Christian Church?

(To this question objection was made.)

Q. You may state whether you were admitted to these meetings as a member or pastor of the Christian Church.

A. I have never heard this mentioned by them. When I first located at Fort Wayne, the ministers of the Methodist Episcopal and Presbyterian Churches sought me out and invited me to take part in making the arrangements for the Week of Prayer.

Q. Now, you say that you were pastor of the Christian Church at Fort Wayne?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did you say they were making arrangements for a meeting?

A. Yes, sir; when I first went to Fort Wayne they were making arrangements in their Ministerial Association for the meetings during the Week of Prayer. As the pastor of the Christian Church there, they invited me to take part in making arrangements for these meetings. In the meetings of this Association I never heard any reference made to the matter of scholastic creeds.

Q. Have your people any general body or convention of any kind?

A. For a few years our churches in this country have held conventions for mutual acquaintance, consultation, and discussion.

Q. Of what are those conventions composed?

A. They are composed of members of the churches, sent as delegates or otherwise.

Q. Of whom are the conventions composed?

A. They are composed of delegates or other members from the different churches throughout the United States. These are missionary or Sunday-school conventions—they have no legislative authority from the churches, and hence they do not seek to establish or change faith and practice in the churches, leaving every thing involved in that as it is found in the Scriptures.

Q. Do you have any conventions in the State of Indiana?

A. Yes, sir; we have what are called State conventions: the State Sunday-school Association, the State Ministerial Association, the State Missionary Association, and Woman's Board of Missions.

Q. How often does the General Convention meet?

A. Once a year.

Q. How often do the State conventions meet?

A. Once a year.

Q. You may state what the form of church government is in the Christian Church?

A. It is what is known as the congregational form.

Cross-Examination by the Counsel for the Defendant.

Q. Mr. Carpenter, do you understand evangelical and orthodox to have any relation in meaning?

A. Yes, sir; I think the two terms are related in meaning.

Q. What does the word evangelical mean?

A. I understand it to mean that which belongs to the teachings of the Scriptures, especially the gospel, the truth taught in the New Testament.

Q. What is the accepted or ordinary meaning of the term evangelical, or evangelist?

A. I do not understand what you mean by your question; but, if it refers to a preacher, then I understand the term evangelist to mean one who goes from place to place preaching the gospel, or truth, of the New Testament, to convert the people to Christ.

Q. Are your teachings evangelical?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. You think the work of an evangelist is to convert the people to Christ?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. An evangelist is one who goes out to preach the gospel?

A. I think that a person who goes out to preach, and preaches the Bible doctrine, is an evangelical preacher.

Q. Now, what do you understand by the word orthodoxy?

A. I understand it to mean a correct faith, a belief in the doctrines which are truly taught in the Scriptures.

Q. What is the standard of that faith or belief?

A. The Bible itself.

Q. Any particular portion of the Bible?

A. Well, orthodoxy is the correct belief or teachings of the whole Bible.

Q. Do you receive all the Bible—the Old and New Testaments?

A. Yes, sir. The whole Bible is received by the Christian Church. The Old Testament gives the teachings and institutions of Moses, the holy inspirations and aspirations of devout and pious men, and the predeclarations of prophetic inspiration—all of these are necessary to give the true teaching of God to men in His revelation; but these are valuable chiefly because they point to a fuller development of them in Jesus as the Christ and to His institutions, which are to be found alone in the New Testament. This gives faith in the Lord Jesus Christ both as the Son of God and the Divine Witness to the truth, and as a personal Saviour, which is necessary in order to receive the benefit of His institutions. As thus explained, the Christian Church accepts the Old and New Testaments as containing the full revelation which God has given to men.

Q. Then you do accept the Old and New Testament Scriptures?

A. Yes, sir; they are accepted as the complete revelation of God to man; but, for the reason that the New Testament contains the teaching and instructions of Jesus and His apostles, in the preaching of the Christian Church greater prominence is given to the New than to the Old Testament.

Q. I do not know as I asked you that.

A. But I see it has been spoken of, and it is necessary in order to understand our people.

Q. I asked you whether or not the Christian Church, as a church, believes that the Old Testament Scriptures are inspired and are of divine authority?

A. The Christian Church believes, sir, that the Old Testament is inspired, just the same as the New Testament is, and that it is a part of the revelation which God has given to men.

Q. Does the Church believe that the Old Testament Scriptures are inspired and hold good to-day—that is, does it believe than any portion of the Old Testament Scriptures is now in force?

A. As a revelation of truth, it believes the Old Testament to be as true now as it ever was, and will ever continue to be; but as to the institutions, worship, and service of Moses, it believes they were taken out of

the way, not to be observed any more, being nailed to the cross of Christ. Paul says of God, among other things He was doing, "Blotting out the handwriting of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, nailing it to his cross." (Colossians ii. 14.)

Q. Then I understand you to say that it is believed that the law of the Old Bible is no longer in force?

A. Perhaps an explanation is necessary. It is believed that men are not now required to observe the law which was contained in ordinances; for it was nailed to the cross of Christ and taken out of the way. For instance: It is not believed that men are now required to observe what is called the Sabbath on the seventh day, for, while there may be a great principle in nature which requires a seventh day rest, and which remains unchanged, it is believed that the positive character of the law of the Sabbath which required its observance on the *last* day of the week, with the other parts of the handwriting of ordinances, was nailed to the cross; and therefore the Christian Church, while it observes the unchangeable principle of a seventh-day rest (that is, one day's rest in seven), keeps the first day of the week sacred because of the resurrection of the divine Saviour from the dead on that day, in accordance with the apostolic example. And further: inasmuch as Jesus has made an atonement for our sins, it is believed that we are not now required to bring animals to be sacrificed upon the altar as they were under the law; but that it is our duty now to "offer the sacrifice of praise to God continually—that is, the fruit of our lips, giving thanks to his name," and to do this we assemble in our sanctuaries every Lord's day.

Q. I will ask you if you think the ten commandments are inspired?

A. Yes, sir; it is believed that the ten commandments are inspired.

Q. Do you believe that all the books of the Old Testament have the same force now?

A. The books of the Old Testament are put into three divisions by the Saviour: the Law, the Prophets, and the Psalms. The Law refers to the five books of Moses, containing the handwriting of ordinances which was nailed to the cross; the Prophets refers to all those books which give a record of events both past and future; and the Psalms refers to those books which give the outflowing of devout hearts, the lofty praise and thanksgiving of inspired souls, and the principles of moral life. All of these are valuable: the first as giving the rise and establishment of a Theocracy among men; the second as giving the history of that Theocracy and unfolding the on-coming future; the third as giving the principles of moral right and the loftiest exultation of the devoutly pious heart. In this sense, all the books of the Old Testament are in force; which one more than the other, if at all. I can not say.

Q. All of it is divine?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Are all its requirements in force? Are they not if it is divine?

A. All the positive requirements of God having filled their specific missions, cease to be of force; the obligations of the moral principles, having as they do a continuous mission, and being right in the nature of things, remain in force. Hence I should say that all the moral laws of the Old Testament, being divine, are still in force.

Q. I speak especially of the ten commandments.

A. I say, as I have before explained, that the Christian Church believes that the ten commandments, so far as the moral principle involved in them is concerned, are divine and still in force; especially that one which says, "Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor." For instance, in the fourth commandment, the Lord says, "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy," and this Sabbath day is explained to be the seventh day of the week; but the principle of a seventh day rest remains the same, whether the rest be observed on the first, the last, or any other day of the week; hence this rest was confined to the seventh day of the week by the positive enactment of the Lord. The Christian Church believes all these positive enactments of the Lord in the dispensations ante-Christian were nailed to the cross of Christ, and taken out of the way, giving place to the positive requirements of the Christian dispensation; hence it keeps the first day of the week as a day of sacred rest, thus observing the moral principle involved in the command. I hope it is now plain that the Christian Church, so far as the moral principle involved in the ten commandments is concerned, accepts them as obligatory; but so far as their positive requirements are concerned, it does not believe them to be now in force.

Q. Is there now, or has there ever been, any formulated creed in your Church?

A. The Scriptures constitute the creed of our Church.

Q. That is, you mean the whole of the Scriptures?

A. The Christian Church accepts the Scriptures as its rule of faith and practice; it has no creed outside of that.

Q. No creed that has been heard of?

A. I never heard of any.

Q. No creed that you have heard of?

A. I have never heard of any, and I have been in position to know.

Q. Men will differ. In the event of a difference of opinion upon any subject or any portion of the Bible, either the Old or the New Testament, springing up between the members of your Church, or between the preachers of your denomination, how do you settle that difference of opinion?

A. Well, in respect to that, we have to do in manner as the other churches do. There is, however, a difference between them and us. When they arraign a man and try him, they do it by their standard, the creed—as Dr. Swing by the Presbyterians, and Dr. Thomas by the Methodists; and when we arraign a man and try him, we do it by our creed, but that is the Bible itself.

Q. Then, so far as the question of membership is concerned, the ultimate judge of it is the membership of the Church?

A. I do not know that I understand the point of your question.

Q. I say, then, so far as questions of belief and the acceptation and interpretation of the Scriptures are concerned, the ultimate judge in the case is the membership of the particular church where the difference arises?

A. Well, it is not probable that our people will have any serious differences; for, in the matters essential to salvation, the Scriptures are plain in statement, giving simple propositions to be believed and clear commandments to be obeyed by unmistakable acts; but in the matters not essential to salvation, in matters of mere opinion, we allow the greatest latitude, the fullest freedom.

Q. Well, in the event there should a case of serious difference arise, I still insist on asking you, who would be the ultimate judge in that matter?

A. Well, as we have never had any such case (and we are not likely to have), any answer I might give would only be an anticipation of it; but, to give my own opinion, I presume, as we have the congregational form of church government, that it would fall to the congregation where the difference should arise to handle it, either by its own membership or by other brethren whom it might select to do so.

Q. So you take the Scriptures only for your essential doctrines?

A. Yes, sir; just the same as they are the standard in matters of correct conduct.

Q. Do you know of any such thing as a serious difference in doctrine having arisen at any time?

A. No, sir; we have never been troubled in that direction, and, as I before said, we are not likely to be. We take the Bible as our rule of faith and practice, and let it do its own preaching; we have never been troubled, to my knowledge, about the questions of doctrine, so-called.

Q. Do you mean to say that in your Church there is no uniform opinion—that one may have his own opinion, no matter what it is?

A. No, sir. The counsel is hard to understand. I will explain, as I have done before: In matters essential to salvation there must be uniformity of opinion; in the things not necessary to salvation the widest

latitude and freedom are granted; the whole thing hinges upon the relation these things sustain, in Bible teaching, to salvation, whether they are necessary or not necessary thereto.

Q. Does your Church believe that the Holy Spirit is an everlasting and uncreated God?

A. I do not know what you mean by that; but, if it is so expressed in the Scriptures, our Church believes it.

Q. Well, what is your idea about it?

A. Well, my opinion is there is no such scriptural expression in the New Testament, nor in the whole Bible.

Q. You are talking about the various scriptural expressions in relation to the divinity of the Spirit?

A. Yes, sir. If it is not taught in the Scriptures that the Spirit is an everlasting and uncreated God, I do not like to accept it; but if there is such an expression in the Scriptures, I would like to know it.

Q. Do you know whether or not there is any teaching in the Scriptures to this effect?

A. Well, I will ask you if there is ıy place in the Scriptures where it is so expressed? It may have escaped my memory.

Q. I beg you not to catechise me—you are the one to answer questions.

A. I take it to be my privilege to ask questions for information. In speaking of that matter, I could only give my opinion.

Q. Well, according to your opinion, then, is there any such teaching in the Scriptures?

A. I think not. This is the reason I did not answer, and asked for a reference.

Q. What are the teachings of your Church in relation to the doctrine of the Trinity—in regard to the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit or Holy Ghost?

A. It is believed that there are three persons; that the Godhead is a trinity—that is, this is the general opinion, I think; but it takes no higher rank than an opinion.

Q. Well, is it held that this Godhead is the same in name with the Father?

A. It is held that it is God; that the Godhead is made up of the trinity, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit.

Q. Will you please answer my question? Does your Church hold that the Holy Spirit or Holy Ghost is the same as the Father?

A. I do not know what you mean—I tried to answer your question.

Q. Do you mean to say you do not know what I mean by the term Father as used in the Scriptures?

A. I do not know what you mean by that expression: "Is this Godhead the same in name with the Father?"

Q. I do not want you to say anything except what you think is true; but I want you to say that much.

A. I will try to answer your question again. It is held that the Godhead is a trinity; that it consists of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit.

Q. Exactly. Now, what do you mean by the Father?

A. It is believed that He was the Creator of the universe, as is taught in the Bible: "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth." It is believed that the Lord Jesus Christ was with the Father before the world was, and was with Him in the creation; that He was in the form of God, and thought it not robbery to make himself equal with God; that He took upon Him the nature of men, and dwelt among them; and that He ascended on high, and is set down at the right hand of the Majesty in the heavens.

Q. Do you understand that the Holy Spirit is subject to the Son, or the Father? What is the understanding as to the Godhead? Is it understood that the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit are one?

A. It is understood that the Son was sent by the Father, and that the Son promised to send the Spirit.

Q. Well, will you give me an answer to the question whether or not it is thought that the Holy Spirit is the same as, and only another name for, the Father?

A. The counsel repeats his question which I have before attempted to answer. I can now do no better than to add an explanation to what I have already said. Man is a wonderful trinity, being composed of body, soul and spirit; and I am unable to explain their relations—what the spirit is made of I am unable to say. So with the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. I apprehend this ineffable trinity as forming one Godhead, but am wholly unable to comprehend the sublime relations that exist between them, or to describe their existence or substance. Hence I prefer, as does the Christian Church also, to leave all expressions in relation to them in the form of Scripture statement.

Q. But I may ask you, do you believe the Holy Spirit was created?

A. No, sir; that is, with my conception of things, I can not conceive how it could be a part of the Godhead and be created—but the Scriptures do not say anything about this.

Q. Now, do you affirm as a cardinal doctrine in your Church or belief that the Holy Spirit is a part of the Everlasting God?

A. It is never put in that way, sir, by our people.

Q. The form of the language is original, is it?

A. We never put it in that way.

Q. I will ask you, what do you mean by that?

A. Well, when we speak of the Holy Spirit and its relations, we never speak of it in that way, for the reason that the expression is never found in the Scriptures.

Q. Well, do you find trinity in the Scriptures?

A. No, sir; that is the reason I explained what I understood the term to mean—yet, after all, the idea is there: "The three are one."

Q. And you do not find orthodox there either, do you?

A. No, sir; and that, again, is the reason why I spoke of it and explained what I understand it to mean. A thing which I can comprehand I may be permitted to explain; but of a thing which is to me incomprehensible, I ought not to be pressed to an explanation.

Q. What does your Church believe baptism to be?

A. It believes baptism to be the immersion of the penitent believer in water into the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit.

Q. Has there been any change in the belief of your Church since it was started by Mr. Alexander Campbell?

A. We never knew that our Church was started by Mr. Alexander Campbell—that is news to us.

Q. What branch of the Church do you belong to?

A. I do not belong to any branch of it; I belong to the Church itself.

Q. There are two branches of it, are there not?

A. Not that I know of.

Q. The Church to which you belong?

A. The Church to which I belong?

Q. Yes, sir.

A. No, sir; I do not know of any two branches of it.

Q. When was it organized?

A. I think about fifty days after the crucifixion of Christ, on the day of Pentecost.

Q. Is that your recollection of it?

A. That is my understanding of it; of course my recollection of it is only a historical recollection.

Q. It has been in existence from that day to this—the Christian Church?

A. Christ said to Peter, "Upon this rock I will build my church: and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven." On the day of Pentecost, Peter used those keys given to him by the Saviour and opened the kingdom of heaven to men; and the Saviour having assured Peter that when His Church was thus established and His Kingdom thus opened the gates of hell should

not prevail against it, I am of the opinion that the gates of hell have never so prevailed, and that the Church of Christ has had an existence from that day to this.

Q. What relation does Alexander Campbell bear to this Church?

A. The Church to which I belong?

Q. Yes, sir.

A. He was a member of it, and an elder in it.

Q. Did he not start the primitive Church?

A. I think not, sir; he lived at too late a period in the Christian era for that.

Q. The first Church, you say—the first Disciples' Church—the first Christian Church, was organized fifty days after the crucifixion of Christ?

A. That is the understanding I have of the matter.

Q. The Disciples' Church—do you assert that this Church to which you belong was then organized?

A. That is my understanding—the Church then organized was made up of disciples, such as I try to be.

Q. Whereabouts was it?

A. I do not understand your question.

Q. Whereabouts was the original Church started?

A. In the city of Jerusalem, and I think about the temple, by the Apostle Peter. On that day there was a great baptism of the Spirit, and the preachers were so filled with it that they spoke as it gave them utterance. The Apostle Peter, being inspired, with the rest of them, preached the same grand gospel that I believe and try to preach, "that God hath made that same Jesus, whom you have crucified, both Lord and Christ;" and three thousand of the hearers that day believed, repented and were baptized, and were added to them. Thus the Kingdom, the Church of Christ, began its onward career; and I believe the gates of hell have never (and never will) prevailed against it.

Q. Do you say the Apostle Peter was the starter of your Church?

A. It is believed he was the first preacher to declare the gospel of the grace of God in fact; that he did this on the day of Pentecost, and that he did it under the full inspiration of the Holy Spirit, with the results just stated.

Q. When in the religious history of the world was your Church—the present organization—first known?

A. We think fifty days after the crucifixion of Christ, on the day of Pentecost.

Q. And you assert that?

A. Yes, sir; that is my understanding of it; and it is true, if I do not mistake myself.

Q. Do you know this? do you recollect it?

A. No, sir, only in the sense in which I recollect other historical facts.

Q. Your Church—the Campbellite Church, the Disciples' Church, the Christian Church—was organized then? Do n't you know that the present Church was not then organized?

A. No, sir; I do not know anything of the kind.

Q. Do n't know anything of the kind? Will you name a preacher of the Campbellite, Disciples', or Christian Church who lived in the last century? And will you tell me where in the United States there was a congregation known by the name of Christian, Disciple, or Campbellite—will you just name one that you know of? Will you have the kindness to tell me where there was one in existence a hundred years ago?

A. On the day of Pentecost, Peter told his three thousand inquirers how they might receive the remission of their sins and thus enter into the Church of Christ. In the record of that day's events, we are told that they all heard of the exaltation of Jesus to be both Lord and Christ, that they were commanded to repent and be baptized in His name for the remission of their sins, and that they all obeyed this command and were thus added to them, thus becoming members of the Church of Christ; and from that day to this, all who do the same things, in the same way, under the same circumstances, and for the same purpose, I believe, are members of the same Church.

Q. Now, of what church are you talking?

A. The Church of Christ.

Q. Then, the Presbyterians, as far as they follow the example of the first Christians, are members of your Church?

A. Well, I do very frequently speak of and to the Presbyterians as brethren; but I do not do this because they are Presbyterians, but because I recognize in them an earnest desire to be Christians—to be simply a Christian, rising above being a Presbyterian.

Q. Now you may state, sir, when in the religious history of the world the Church known as the Christian Church first claimed any separate Christian organization.

A. Immediately after the day of Pentecost the Church of Christ was irreparably separated from the Jewish institution; but the name Christian was not applied to them until a church had been organized at Antioch in Syria. "And the disciples were called Christians first in Antioch." (Acts xii. 26.)

Q. You say that the Christian Church has been known through the whole history of the world from that down to this? your Church?

A. Yes, sir; that is what I stated.

Q. Now, you understand, sir—I will ask you—I ask you when the first religious organization of disciples or Christians came to be known?

A. I have already answered that; on and after the day of Pentecost, at Jerusalem and Antioch.

Q. The Church to which you belong?

A. Yes, sir; I have already answered that, too.

Q. Yes, sir. I will ask you, where did this denomination—the Christian or Campbellite denomination—first originate?

A. I can only repeat my former answer, that from the first it has been known by that name, the Church of Christ or Christian Church—our organization.

Q. Do you continue to say that it was organized fifty days after the crucifixion of Christ?

A. That is just what I continue to say. We believe the Church of Christ was organized as I have already so often stated. In respect of Mr. Campbell, it is held by our people that he had no more authority to organize a church than anybody else; that he was under as much obligation to become obedient to the requirements of the Church already organized as any one else. Instead of being the organizer of the Church, he only called attention to the one that had been organized under the inspired authority of the apostles of Christ.

Q. Then your organization had been dormant until Mr. Campbell warmed it up and started it into new life—is that your idea?

A. No, sir; I have no such idea.

Q. Mr. Carpenter, don't you preach—I have asked when this denomination called Christian, or Disciple, or Campbellite, was first organized?

A. And so you have, and I have already answered it.

Q. I will ask you to state, sir, whether or not the denomination of which you speak, the Church to which you say you belong—I say I will ask you, was not that Church originally started by Alexander Campbell and his father; whether or not he did not start it in 1823? Was he not the founder of that denomination?

A. I do not so understand it.

Q. You don't? Do you understand your denomination was started as a reform?

A. No, sir; not so much a reformation, though this term is sometimes applied to it, as a restoration. The work of Mr. Campbell and his coadjutors was to restore primitive Christianity in its faith, in its practice, and in its organization.

Q. I want to ask you, sir, if prior to this time (1823) there was any such institution among men as this denomination known as Christian?

A. Over and over again I have explained that, sir.

Q. It was started, then, fifty days after the crucifixion of Christ?

A. It was. I understand, according to the teaching of the Scriptures, that the Church of Christ began at Pentecost.

Q. Do you so understand it? Do you so assert it?

A. That is my belief.

Q. Now, sir, I will ask you this question again, and I want it answered. When was this particular denomination of which you are a member started?

A. I have already explained that question again and again. What further answer does it need?

Q. It was started fifty days after the crucifixion of Christ?

A. Yes, sir; that is my understandiug of it.

Q. As a separate organization, the Christian denomination?

A. As the Church of Christ.

Q. Was there any such Church during the Dark Ages?

A. We think the word of God able——

Q. Answer the question. Was there any such Church during the Dark Ages?

A. Some questions can not be answered by "yes, sir," and "no, sir."

(To this question objection was made, but it was repeated.)

Q. Was this denomination of which you are a member, this particular Disciples', or Christian, or Campbellite Church, in existence as a Christian organization during the Dark Ages?

A. My knowledge of the Dark Ages is historical. If that is the kind of evidence the counsel wants, I can readily answer that it is my understanding that during the whole period of what is called the Dark Ages there was a great number of persons who were members of the Church of Christ.

Q. What church was there, what Christian Church was there except the Roman Catholic Church?

A. My answer must again be historical. There were the Albigenses, the Vaudois, the Waldenses, and that long line of heroic representatives of the faith of Christ that made the valleys of Piedmont and elsewhere ring with the praises of a simple worship. Aye, the Lord was not without a people, even during the grossest blindness of the Dark Ages, and he did not have to go to the Roman Catholic Church to find them.

Q. Now, Mr. Carpenter, do you testify to this jury that your Church, the real denomination, was known by the name of Christian or Disciples originally?

A. No, sir; I have not testified to that or any other denomination as being called Christian; the idea of denomination has been entirely left out of my view.

Q. You have not? I have been asking you for a half-hour if you could tell me where that denomination originated.

A. I have answered that several times, but because the counsel is used to the jargon of a divided Christendom he may not have apprehended my answers. As a people, we discard the idea of denomination, and desire to be known, and really to be, the Church of Christ—the Church which was established by His authority and in which there is no division. If we have been true to our aim, and I believe we have, touching questions of origin, start, etc., I can give no other answer than I have given—fifty days after the crucifixion of Christ. It does not take denominational existence to make church existence, though in common usage the term church may be applied to them.

Q. That is your answer to my question?

A. If I can throw any further light on any particular point, I shall be glad to do so.

Q. What is the name of this denomination?

A. The counsel persists in the use of the term denomination. As a people, we are recognized in the religious world as the Church of Christ, or Christian Church.

Q. When was this particular organization, of which you speak, originally known?

A. I have already explained that.

Q. Well, explain it again.

A. In the Scriptures we have the Church of Christ set forth and its organization described. Of this Church I claim to be a member. Now, it is not claimed that the Church of Christ is made up of any particular congregation or congregations bound together by any human ecclesiastical law; but it is claimed, as so often stated, that the Church of Christ was organized on the day of Pentecost, fifty days after the crucifixion of Christ, and from that day to this the Lord has had a people who served Him in the true Church of Christ, even during the Dark Ages. This whole body of the Lord's people we understand to be the Church of Christ; the separate local congregations are known among us, as they were known in the Scripture times, as churches of Christ.

Q. Do n't you preach—I will ask you when the Methodist Episcopal Church was organized?

A. I can not testify to the day, sir.

Q. I did not ask you to testify to the day, sir; but to the year. When was it?

A. I do not know, sir.

Q. Have you meant to testify to this jury, sir, that it is your understanding that every man who has lived—every follower of Jesus Christ since the day of Pentecost has been a member of your Church?

A. I understand that every man who has lived since that time, being

a Christian, has been a member of the Church of Christ—that he has belonged to His Church.

Q. Mr. Carpenter, do you testify that every man who has lived since the day of Pentecost, being a Christian, has been a member of the *Christian* Church?

A. No, sir; I do not so testify, in the limited sense in which I understand the counsel to use the word Christian.

Q. Well, sir, you say you did not say that?

A. I say I have not said it.

Q. That there have not been members of your particular branch of the Church ever since the day of Pentecost?

A. I have made some statements to the jury, and I have given some reasons why I think there have been members of the Church of Christ ever since it was first organized, on the day of Pentecost; but that is quite a different thing from saying that they belonged to our particular local congregations.

Q. You say that you do n't understand?

A. No, sir; on the other hand, I have stated it several times.

Q. Now tell us when this particular branch of the Christian Church was started.

A. The counsel still clings to the "branch" of the Church. Our people do not recognize any branches of the Church of Christ. We realize that there are many in the so-called denominations whom we would fain believe are Christians—are members of the Church of Christ, and we are glad to recognize them as such; not because they are Methodists, Presbyterians, Baptists, etc., but because they are something over and above what these sectarian names would indicate; that they are true followers of Christ. But if the counsel desires me to testify at what particular time these particular religious congregations, of one of which I am a member, began to be organized as congregations and thus to be known in the history of this country, I can do so; and I would say that the first one thus organized as a congregation (not as the Church of Christ in that wide sense in which I have been using that application) was in about the year 1823.

Q. Was there ever any particular Church so known before that time? any particular denomination?

A. We think there have been congregations, churches, members of the Church of Christ during all these ages, else the declaration of Christ is not true, "The gates of hell shall not prevail against it." But that is not equivalent to saying that denominations have so existed, or that denominations, as such, are any part of the Church of Christ.

Q. Was there ever any such Church until it was started by Alexander Campbell?

A. I never knew that Alexander Campbell started a church.

Q. Who, then, started a church in 1823?

A. I do not know.

Q. Who, then, called attention to those congregations, of which you spoke, in 1823?

A. Well, when those congregations were separately organized (only as local organizations, however), among the people who were members of them was Alexander Campbell, Thomas Campbell, Walter Scott, *et al.*, all of whom plead for a restoration of the primitive Church of Christ as it was established at Pentecost and maintained during the apostolic times.

Q. The persons forming those congregations were seceding members from the Baptist Church, were they not?

A. I have no such understanding.

Q. They were apostates from the Baptist Church, were they not?

A. That can't be said, unless it can be said that the three thousand who entered the Church of Christ on the day of Pentecost were apostates from the Jewish institution; unless it can be said that leaving the wrong and going into the right is an apostasy.

Q. Do you know anything about that matter—who composed those congregations in 1823?

A. I have some historical knowledge upon the subject.

Q. Was not Alexander Campbell—was he not the founder of the Church in the same sense that Wesley was the founder of the Methodist Church?

A. I do not know in what sense you mean that Wesley was the founder of the Methodist Church.

Q. Do you assert that you do not know?

A. I assert that I do not know.

Q. Oh! you are too wise.

A. That is just what I am trying to come at.

Q. You say that Alexander Campbell originally was not the founder of the Campbellite, or Christian, or Disciples' Church, in the same sense in which John Wesley was the founder of the Methodist Church? What do you say?

A. I can explain it, if I understand you.

Q. Well, explain it in whatever sense you please.

A. John Wesley was the founder of the Methodist Church in that he was the originator of the movement, which was an entirely new one; in that in its first stages he dictated its teachings and policy, which teachings and policy finally crystallized in the Discipline of the Methodist Church; and in that this Discipline forms the constitution of the Church—the standard by by which all heresies and disorders in it are tried. Alexander Campbell

was not the founder of the Church of Christ; because the congregations he established were only local and under a standard already erected (the Bible), upon a constitution already adopted (Christ and His teachings, through himself and His apostles), and in a movement already inaugurated (at Pentecost). One who helps to carry on a movement already begun, under limitations already established, and under a standard already provided, can not be said to be the originator of the movement. That is Alexander Campbell.

Q. Do you know when the first church organization was known as Christian, if there were any in existence before the time Alexander Campbell organized his first congregations? If so, you may state where one existed.

A. Do you mean historical knowledge? Of course I have no means of knowing things before I was born, except historically.

Q. You have no knowledge of that matter, then?

A. I have historical knowledge, I say; knowledge I have obtained from what I have read.

Q. Now, you testified that the Church was organized on the day of Pentecost. Why can 't you answer my question as to the existence of congregations before the time of Alexander Campbell?

A. I can testify to that just in the same way that I did to the other.

Q. In what way can you testify to that, then?

A. I have historical knowledge upon that point, and can testify that there were congregations, such as I have described, before the time of Alexander Campbell.

Q. Well, where were they?

A. At Antioch in Syria, and at Corinth in Greece, such congregations existed.

Q. Was there more than one branch of the Church at that time?

A. No, sir; there was no branch at all.

Q. What did you say—that there was more than one branch?

A. No, sir.

Q. Now, you say that there is no branch of the Church to which you belong. I will ask you this question, Do you say to the jury that there was a separate organization of the Church—of the Christian Church to which you belong—existing in this country prior to the organization of congregations by Alexander Campbell?

A. That depends upon what you call the Christian Church. If you refer to an ecclesiastical body, composed of various congregations, bound together by an organization having episcopal, presbyterial, or other functions, and ruled by officers other than the officers of the local congregation, then I must say there was not before that time, and that there has

not been since. In that sense, there is not now, nor has there ever been, a Christian Church, the Church of Christ, in this country.

Q. Well, then, I will ask you to state to the jury whether or not this people, of whom we have been speaking, ever were in the relation of a Christian Church; do you understand that to be a fact?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. That is what you mean?

A. Yes, sir; that is what I said.

Q. Now, then, I repeat the question, Do you know of any separate body or organization, in the relation of a Christian Church, that existed before the time of Alexander Campbell?

A. Historically I do, as I have already explained.

Q. What one? will you mention it?

A. The church at Jerusalem, the church at Antioch, the church at Thessalonica, etc. Now, I understand that these churches belonged to the same great body that the church to which Alexander Campbell belonged did; for the same doctrine was believed——

Q. I want to ask——

A. Will you wait till I get through my answer? The same doctrine was believed, the churches are organized alike—with the same officials performing like duties, in the churches the same services were performed, and the same kind of work was being accomplished. The churches were built upon the same foundation (apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone), they rallied under the same holy standard (the Word of God), and they acknowledged the same divine Head (the Lord Jesus Christ). With all these essential elements coinciding, we believe that these churches are parts of the same great body as that to which the churches at Jerusalem, Antioch, Thessalonica, etc., belonged; and, if so, then the body to which Alexander Campbell belonged existed long centuries before his time, and has the divine sanction of the great Head of the Church.

Q. Now, then, I will repeat my question, for I want it answered: Do you say, sir, that there was a church of the same denomination to which you belong, a Christian Church, as a separate organization, teaching and preaching and professing the same doctrines and belief that you preach and profess, before Alexander Campbell organized the congregations he did?

A. I have repeatedly explained that we think there has been, sir; we think that the churches organized under the apostles' teaching, whether in apostolic or subsequent times, are the same.

Q. What was their name before Campbell's time?

A. God's people have been called Christians ever since the disciples were called Christians at Antioch.

Q. I will ask you, Do you understand that, from the landing of the Pilgrims at Plymouth Rock down to the time that Mr. Campbell organized his first congregation, a Church was known as a Christian Church—indeed, at any time since the primitive Church, since the apostles?

A. I have already explained that the Church, as we understand it, is made up of all God's people who are truly united to Christ; that is, the local congregations (and that is the only divine organization known to us) do not necessarily constitute the Church of Christ, but that the Church is composed of all God's people who are truly in Christ, whether it pertains to present or primitive times, or to this or other lands. The Roman Catholic Church, as an organization, can no more rightfully claim to be the Church of Christ, because it teaches and practices some of the precepts and injunctions of Christ and His apostles, than it can be claimed a locomotive is a wagon because it has wheels; and the same may as truly be said of all other organizations claiming to be the Church of Christ which have teachings, practices, and elements of organization which are different from the primitive Church as organized under the direction of Christ and His apostles. Recognizing this truth, the people with whom I am identified, and whose orthodoxy is here called in question, seek to pattern their congregations after the divine model, and to teach the same doctrine and to practice the same precepts that were taught and practiced by the apostolic Church; and they believe that in so doing they are laboring to restore the Church of Christ to its primitive purity and conquering power.

Q. You say, now, referring to the organization of these churches—when were these churches, or congregations, first known in the religious history of this country?

A. I have already explained that my historical knowledge of the fact is that they became known in about the year 1823.

Q. Who originated this movement?

A. If your question refers to the first movement to restore primitive Christianity in this country, then I think it was Mr. Campbell and his colaborers.

Q. Was not Alexander Campbell the great promoter of it?

A. I certainly think that Alexander Campbell was a great teacher.

Q. But was not he the great promoter of it?

A. I think while——

Q. But, now, was not Mr. Alexander Campbell a prominent and distinguished man in your Church?

A. No more so than many others, and only so because of his eminent abilities as a teacher and defender of the Bible doctrine, both by word of mouth and by his pen.

Q. Was he the author of the *Christian System?*

A. If your question refers to the great plan of salvation by which men are to be saved, I must say no, for Jesus "became to all who obey him the author of eternal salvation;" but if it refers to a book, I can say that he was the author of quite a number of volumes.

Q. Was he the author of *The Christian System?*

A. My understanding is that he was the author of a book called *The Christian System.*

Q. This book unfolds the doctrine or belief of your Church.

A. This book unfolds Mr. Campbell's conception of the Bible teaching on the great question of man's salvation; and I may say that these views are largely held by the membership of the Church, but not on account of any ecclesiastical action of the Church.

Q. Well, sir—well, sir, do you—do you say that—if I recollect you, you said that regeneration is essential to salvation.

A. I did, sir; at any rate, if I did not I say so now.

Q. That a man must be regenerated? Do you believe when a man is pardoned he is saved?

A. I do, sir—from his past sins.

Q. Do you believe he is saved through the blood of Christ alone?

A. In one sense, I do, sir; it is "the blood of Christ that cleanses from all sin."

Q. Do you believe that a man can inherit salvation except through the blood of Christ alone?

A. I do not know what you mean by your question. The gospel requires that one believes in order to be saved.

Q. Do you believe that the blood of Christ alone saves men?

A. The blood of Christ is that which cleanses a man from all sin.

Q. You believe that the blood of the Saviour saves a man from all sin, do you?

A. We do; most emphetically we do, sir.

Q. Do you believe this, then? I will read from *The Christian System*, by Alexander Campbell: "Reader, reflect—what a jargon, what a confusion, have the mystic doctors made of this metaphorical expression, and of this topic of regeneration. To call the receiving of any spirit or influence, or energy, or any operation upon the heart of man, regeneration, is an abuse of all speech, as well as a departure from the diction of the Holy Spirit, *who calls nothing personal regeneration except the act of immersion.*" (*Christian System, p. 203.*) Do you hold that?

A. I think that Alexander Campbell is right in that statement, if he is understood as he meant to be. If you desire it, I can explain what I understand him to have meant.

Q. Does your Church believe that a man can not be saved except he be born of water, be resurrected from the water?

A. It believes that "except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he can not enter into the kingdom of God."

Q. You think it is necessary to be born of water and of the Spirit in order to be saved? You think a man must be born through the water—is that the doctrine you teach?

A. The Church believes just what the Saviour said to Nicodemus: "Except that a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he can not enter into the kingdom of God."

Q. Will you answer the question? Do you believe it is not sufficient, or that a man can not be saved, if he be born only of the Spirit? Do you contend that he *must* be born of the water?

A. It is believed that a man *must be born again;* and that baptism is the consummating act in this new birth. If a child can be born without the consummating act of birth, then may a man be born anew without baptism. At any rate, the Saviour puts it in strong light: "Jesus, answered, verily, verily, I say unto thee, except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he can not enter into the kingdom of God. That which is born of the flesh is flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit. Marvel not that I said unto thee, ye must be born again." (John iii. 5–7.)

Q. Does your Church hold that a person can not be regenerated, or saved, except he be immersed?

A. No, sir, it does not; but I think it will be necessary for me to explain in order that this be understood. The conception of regeneration which is held by the denominations generally is not the conception of regeneration which Mr. Campbell held and advocated. He taught that to be regenerated, or born again, a man must be all that the denominations call regenerated—changed of mind, changed of will, changed of heart—and in addition to that, as the Saviour taught, he must be born of water, which is the consummating act in the process of regeneration, of being born again, as he taught.

Q. Now you may listen to what I read——

A. Shall I remain in my seat?

Q. "Some curious criticisms have been offered, to escape the force of the plain declaration of Jesus and his apostles upon this subject. Some say that the words 'Except a man be born of water and Spirit,' are not to be understood literally. Surely, then, if to be born of water does not mean to be born of water, to be born of the Spirit must mean something else than to be born of the Spirit. This is so fanatical and extravagant as to need no other exposure. He who can not see the propriety of calling immersion a being born again can see no propriety in any metaphor in

common use. A resurrection is a new birth. Jesus is said to be the *first-born* from the dead, because the first who rose from the dead to die no more. And, surely, there is no abuse of speech, but the greatest propriety, in saying that he who has died to sin, and been buried in water, when raised up again out of that element, is born again or regenerated. If Jesus was born again when he came out of a sepulcher, surely he is born again who is raised up out of a grave of water." (*Christian System, pp. 202–3.*) Now, sir, do you say that Alexander Campbell did not teach that as fundamental, that personal regeneration is being born again, that regeneration and being born again are the same?

A. No, sir, only in the sense that the name of the last act in a process is very frequently—nearly always—given to the whole process. In the extract you have read, Mr. Campbell predicates being born again upon one having died to sin, a thing that antedates the being buried in the water and the birth from it. He taught that regeneration, in the strict sense of the term, is a process of which the being born again is the last act. Hear him on this point: "Moreover, we think it will be granted, that, whatever may be the scriptural acceptation of the word *generation*, regeneration is only a repetition of the act or process. After a close examination of the passages in which *generation* occurs in the writings of the Hebrew prophets and apostles, we find it used only in two acceptations—as descriptive of the whole process of creation and of the thing created. A race of men, or a particular class of men, is called a *generation;* but this is its figurative rather than its literal meaning. Its literal meaning is the formation or creation of anything. Thus it is first used in the Holy Scriptures. Moses calls the creation, or whole process of formation of the heavens and the earth, 'The *generations* of the heavens and the earth.' (Genesis ii. 4.) The account of the formation of Adam and Eve, and also the account of the creations of Adam and Eve, are, by the same writer, called 'The book or record of the *generations* of Adam.' (Genesis v. 1.) This is the literal import of the word; consequently, *regeneration* literally indicates the whole process of renovating or new-creating man. This process may consist of numerous distinct acts; but it is in accordance with general usage to give to the beginning or consummating act the name of the whole process. For the most part, however, the name of the whole process is given to the consummating act, because the process is always supposed to be incomplete until that act is performed. . . . . In the same sense it is, that most Christians call *regeneration* the NEW BIRTH; though being born is only the last act in natural generation, and the last act in regeneration." (*The Christian System, pp. 262–3.*)

Q. I will read further:

A. Read a little before where you last read, please.

Q. Yes, sir; "The Spirit of God is the begetter, the gospel is the seed; and, being thus begotten and quickened, we are born of the water. A child is alive before it is born, and the act of being born only changes its state, not its life. Just so is the metaphorical birth. Persons are begotten by the Spirit of God, impregnated by the Word, and born of the water." (*The Christian System, p. 201.*)

A. That is what I believe.

Q. Raised up out of the element of water is born again—born of the Spirit and raised up out of the grave of water?

A. What Mr. Campbell said is what I believe, exactly. As to the figure involved in the grave of water, it is taught that men must die to sin, that the death must be before the burial in baptism.

Q. And that personal regeneration consists in the act of immersion?

A. It is believed, as has been explained, and as Mr. Campbell has taught, when presented under the metaphor of a new birth it consists of the begetting of the Spirit, the impregnation of the Word, and the birth of water; but when presented under the metaphor of life from the dead, it consists of death to sin, as Christ died, a burial as He was buried, and a resurrection as He was raised from the dead; both of these metaphors describe the same process, and find their completing act in the same thing—baptism.

Q. Mr. Carpenter, tell us whether a man's sins are washed away—whether or not immersion is the act of conversion or regeneration?

A. As to the first part of the question, the Scriptures represent Ananias as saying to Saul: "And now why tarriest thou? arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord." (Acts xxii. 16.) As to the second part of the question, immersion has nothing to do whatever with conversion unless it be preceded by a living faith and a genuine turning away from all sin—a turning toward a reformation of life—and an acceptance of Jesus as the only Saviour; having these antecedents, and being a faith-act, it brings the sinner into the enjoyment of the blessings of Christ.

Q. Do I understand you to say it is a part of the teachings of your Church that a person is not converted to God until he is immersed?

A. In the sense that immersion is the consummating act in the process of conversion—that is, in the whole process of bringing a condemned sinner from the kingdom of Satan and translating him into the kingdom of God's dear Son, immersion is the last act which is done to bring him into the Church of Christ—it is taught that a man must be immersed.

Q. Is there any other way for a man to be converted than that way?

A. Scholastic and opinionative theology points out a good many ways: by the whisperings of a small, still voice, by a long series of peculiar ex-

periences, by the miraculous in-working of the Holy Spirit, etc., etc. But any way that does not produce faith in the Lord Jesus Christ as the Son of God, a thorough reformation of life, and a submission to the command of the Divine Christ in immersion, if baptism be by immersion—of which I have no doubt—fails to conform to the Scriptural teaching upon this subject.

Q. But is there not some other way for a man to be Scripturally converted except by immersion?

A. Mr. Campbell has taught, and the Christian Church urges, the importance of the divinely appointed ordinance of baptism, and it is believed that immersion is the only baptism. Now, in the divine plan of salvation, baptism has its place, to tear it from which is sacrilegious; and the Christian Church believes it is the divine ordinance which stands between the world and the Church, and, therefore, that the penitent believer, in order to come into the Church, must come through the ordinance of baptism. This is common ground with all orders of Christian religionists, with perhaps the Quakers alone as an exception—no members are ever admitted into any church unless they have been what they call baptized. In that sense of the word it is the means of being born into the Church of Christ, the family of God.

Q. Do you mean to say that your Church does not teach that, according to the New Testament Scriptures, in coming to God, baptism is for the remission of sins?

A. It is taught that the remission of sins is to be obtained in Jesus Christ, and that the penitent believer comes to the Lord Jesus Christ by being buried with Him in baptism: "Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ, were baptized into his death." (Romans vi. 3.)

Q. Suppose the penitent believer is not immersed?

A. Suppose that he is not immersed? Then we leave him entirely with God—God has not revealed what He would do with that man.

Q. I will ask you, from what you know of your Church, whether or not it is its belief that unless a man is immersed he can not be saved?

A. No, sir; the Church has no such belief.

Q. Of course the thief on the cross could not have been baptized.

A. Presumably not; but he died before there was any such thing as Christian baptism, such as we have been talking about; besides, we believe there will be more persons in heaven who were not baptized than there will be who were.

Q. Is that your teaching?

A. That is the teaching of the Christian Church.

Q. Then it is the belief of your Church that baptism is not at all necessary?

A. No, sir; that is not the belief of the Christian Church.

Q. I understand you, then, that if a man be not immersed he will be lost if he could have been?

A. No, sir; I did not say so. I believe there will be persons in heaven who were not immersed; but the sane, responsible, sinful man can not fill all the requirements of the gospel without being immersed, as I believe, and thus come within the range of the gospel promises. We teach men not to rely upon anything for salvation until they have met all the gospel requirements; then we teach them to implicitly trust the promises of God that He will save them.

Q. But you teach them that there is no other form of baptism except by immersion?

A. We believe that immersion is the only baptism inculcated in the Christian Scriptures, and that this command of the divine Saviour can not be obeyed otherwise; but we do not take upon ourselves the presumption to say what God *must* and *shall* do in cases where it has not thus been obeyed. The teaching of John Wesley is presumably true upon this point: "But the benefit of this [the remedy which had been found by the second Adam for the removal of original sin] is to be received through the means which he hath appointed; through baptism in particular, which is the ordinary means he hath appointed for that purpose; *and to which God hath tied us, though he may not have tied himself.*"—[Italics mine.—ED.] (*Wesley's Doctrinal Tracts, p. 251*, edition 1850, New York.) As I have said before, touching Mr. Campbell's teaching on baptism for the remission of sins, he must be allowed his own interpretation of it.

Q. What book is that you have?

A. It is *The Christian System.* I also have *Campbell and Rice's Debate.*

Q. What is the page?

A. Page 58.

Q. What part of the page?

A. In paragraph numbered VI., Mr. Campbell has given his own explanation of the relation which baptism, in the divine plan of salvation, sustains to the blood of Christ and remission of sins; and, as every man has the right to be understood in the light of his own explanation, I desire that this go to the jury: "Baptism is, then, designed to introduce the subjects of it into participation of the blessings of the death and resurrection of Christ; who 'died for our sins,' and 'rose again for our justification.' But it has no abstract efficacy. Without previous faith in the blood of Christ, and deep and unfeigned repentance before God, neither immersion in water, nor any other action, can secure to us the blessings of peace and pardon. It can merit nothing. Still to the believing penitent it is the *means* of receiving formal, distinct, and specific absolution, or release from

guilt. Therefore, none but those who have first believed the testimony of God and have repented of their sins, and who have been intelligently immersed into his death, have the full and explicit testimony of God, assuring them of pardon. To such only as are truly penitent, dare we say, 'Arise and be baptized, and wash away your sins, calling upon the name of the Lord,' and to such only can we say with assurance, 'You are washed, you are justified, you are sanctified in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God.'" (*Christian System, p. 58.*)

Q. I will ask you, sir: I understand Mr. Campbell to be speaking about personal sins, and not original sin, in this abstract. Am I right about that?

A. Yes, sir; and I am glad you are.

Q. And, as he taught, baptism does not save the sinner only from his past personal sins—is this the distinction you make? Is this the teaching of your Church?

A. As I understand it, that is the teaching both of Mr. Campbell and the Christian Church.

Q. That the blood of Christ is a propitiation for sin; that men are to be baptized into the death of Christ, and that this baptism is to be in likeness to his burial and resurrection?

A. That is what we teach.

Q. That baptism is the immersion of a believer into Christ?

A. That is what we teach, as I have explained.

Q. That baptism has no secret efficacy?

A. We teach that it has no efficacy of itself.

Q. Are we to understand by that that it has no efficacy at all?

A. No, sir; we understand it to have the same efficacy attached to it in its legal obedience as the marriage ceremony has in marriage, and the oath of allegiance has in the naturalization of a foreigner.

Q. Exactly. In other words, a man can not be legally married unless there be a celebration of the marriage ceremony? Then, as a man can not be legally married without the celebration of the marriage ceremony, so one can not become a Christian without the observance of baptism?

A. What I have said does not warrant that conclusion.

Q. I understand you to say that baptism sustains the same relation to the Christian that the celebration of the marriage ceremony does to the married state?

A. Yes, sir; I have stated something like that.

Q. Now, as a man can not be legally married unless he goes through the process of the marriage ceremony, so one can not be saved unless he be immersed?

A. No, sir; I have already stated that to the jury several times. The

counsel's comparisons are of unlike things. Let me make a statement of the thing involved in these comparisons: as the wife can not claim any right to the possessions of her husband without the solemnization of the marriage ceremony, and as the foreigner can not claim the protection of the government of the United States without the naturalization effected by the oath of allegiance, so the condemned sinner can not lay any claim to the blessings and privileges of the Church of Christ without obeying the transitional command of baptism, which is the consummating act that brings him into the body of Christ.

Q. Well, now, I will read again: "They were informed that, though they now believed and repented, they were not pardoned, but must '*reform and be immersed for the remission of sins.*' Immersion for the forgiveness of sins was *the command* addressed to these believers, to these penitents, in answer to the most earnest question." (*Christian System, p. 195.*)

A. That expresses the belief of the Christian Church.

Q. You believe that?

A. Yes, sir; we believe that.

Q. The only way the gospel specifies for men to be saved is by being plunged or immersed in the water?

A. That is not what Alexander Campbell says.

Q. I will ask you to read what he says: "This act of faith was presented as that act by which a change in their state could be effected; or, in other words, by which alone they could be pardoned, They 'who gladly received this word were that day immersed;' or, in other words, the same day were converted, or regenerated, or obeyed the gospel." (*Christian System, p. 195.*)

A. That is what we teach; we never hesitate to teach what Peter did.

Q. Now, does not that plainly teach that unless one has been immersed he can not be saved?

A. While it may not just say that, this is true: to the man to whom the plain demands of the gospel have come, and who refuses to be baptized, there is no promise of salvation.

Q. Now, sir, I will ask you whether or not the passages I have read do not distinctly teach that the believing penitent can not be received, according to the formulated specifications of the gospel, or released from his guilt, except by the means of immersion—is that not what is taught?

A. If I now comprehend what you mean by your question, I answer that we teach it.

Q. Is this the way: Change of life precedes baptism, and baptism constitutes the legal act by which the penitent believer receives remission of his sin?

A. Mr. Campbell has taught, and the Christian Church believes, that baptism is the scripturally appointed means by which the penitent believer is to come to the death of Christ, and, consequently, to His blood; and through this appointed means of coming to His blood he receives remission of his sins, for "the blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin."

Q. Now, if you are through, I will ask you to answer the question.

A. I am willing to do so.

Q. I will ask you whether or not the act of baptism by immersion is not the means, and the only means, specified by Alexander Campbell, whereby a sinner may be received and justified according to the gospel—whereby he may be released from his guilt?

A. No, sir; but he continually specifies that there must be the antecedents of baptism, faith and repentance.

Q. Does he not say that it is the means by which he is saved from sin, justified according to the gospel, and released from guilt?

A. Mr. Campbell has taught, and the Christian Church believes, that baptism is the only scriptural ordinance or institution by which or through which the penitent believer is to pass from an unsaved to a saved state.

Q. I now call your attention to what Mr. Campbell further says: "They taught all the disciples to consider not only themselves as saved persons, but all whom they saw or knew to be immersed into the Lord Jesus. They saluted every one, on his coming out of the water, as *saved*, and recorded him as such. Luke writes, 'The Lord added *the saved* daily to the congregation.'" (*Christian System, p. 209.*) Now, is this the doctrine of your Church?

A. We are willing to believe and teach what Luke says of this matter. If he says the Lord added the saved to the congregation in the way he had stated before, why, it is ours to believe it and teach it. But upon this point let me introduce another statement from Mr. Campbell: "While we regard immersion, or Christian baptism, as a wise, benevolent, and useful institution, we neither disparage, nor underrate, a new heart, repentance, or faith; nay, we teach with clearness and definiteness that, unpreceded by faith and repentance, it is of no value whatsoever. These two constitute a change of heart, a mental conversion; for all believing penitents have a new heart, and are prepared for being born into the kingdom of God." (*Campbell and Rice's Debate, p. 555.*)

Q. I will now call your attention——

A. Before being called away from this, I desire to give the jury another statement by Mr. Campbell. He says: "You may have heard me say here (and the whole country may have read it and heard it many a time) that a seven-fold immersion in the river Jordan, or any other water,

without a previous change of heart, will avail nothing, without a genuine faith and penitence. Nor would the most strict conformity to all the forms and usages of the most perfect church order; the most exact observance of all the ordinances, without personal faith, piety, and moral righteousness—without a new heart, hallowed lips, and a holy life, profit any man in reference to eternal salvation." (*Campbell and Rice, p. 678.*)

Q. Well, Alexander Campbell held a debate with Dr. Rice, of the Presbyterian Church, did he not?

A. He did, sir.

Q. Mr. Rice made charges against Mr. Campbell, stating that he was not orthodox, alleging that he did not accept the Scriptures, and thus giving him an opportunity to take a position upon that subject. But what did he do? He tried to head around it and get out of it. Is not that true?

A. I know nothing of Mr. Rice's making charges against Mr. Campbell of heterodoxy, but Mr. Campbell made a statement with reference to the whisperings and gossip of a certain kind of religionists upon this subject, that was so satisfactory that the matter was not mentioned afterward. He said: "Much has been said, and whispered, and gossiped concerning my heterodoxy. But, sir, allow me to compliment myself—I am, in all the great and weighty matters of religion, more orthodox than any of my impugners. I speak it not boastingly, sir, but in declaration of my general views of all gospel truths. I do not believe, sir, most sincerely, that there is any of those gentlemen that oppose us, more radically and universally orthodox on all these great subjects of evangelical faith, piety, and morality than we." (*Campbell and Rice, p. 701.*)

Q. Now, Mr. Campbell in his debate with Mr. Rice, in answering a statement that had been made in reference to his remarks, said: "According to my friend, every infant that is baptized, no matter how the ceremony is performed, is baptismally purified; and, consequently, without faith; and, therefore, his purification is without faith. I believe that this baptismal purification comes through faith only. Hence faith is the vital principle, without which it is impossible to please God. According to my views, a person believes, repents, and is baptized in order to purification. According to his views, he is purified, sanctified, adopted, if an adult, by faith alone; but, if an infant, by sprinkling alone, without faith or intelligence. An adult, with him, if he have faith he has everything—pardon, justification, sanctification; he is a child of God, he is begotten of God, he is born of God, has everything. There is no use for baptism or the Lord's supper; all means and ordinances, according to his position, are mere superfluities, so far as these benefits are implied. But we plead for faith, because without it we can not please God; but not for faith alone." (*Campbell and Rice, p. 458.*) Is that your doctrine?

A. Yes, sir; that is the doctrine of the Christian Church—it is accepted in the sense in which Mr. Campbell presented it.

Q. Well, now, this is your——

A. I desire here to say that what Mr. Campbell has taught respecting the ordinance of baptism, with Mr. Campbell's own explanation of that teaching, the Christian Church believes from beginning to end; but we do not accept it as his enemies and the counsel have tried to interpret it.

Q. Now it appears that you have shown an extraordinary memory in answering as to the doctrines of your Church; but you have repeatedly stated to the jury that, with his explanations, you believe what Mr. Campbell says. Now, do you think he is always right?

A. No, sir; we do not, by any means.

Q. Does every member exercise this right of discrimination?

A. They may, for the teachings of Alexander Campbell are accepted in precisely the same way as the teachings of any other man are accepted.

Q. Don't each member of your Church believe what he pleases?

A. No one is compelled to believe a thing because Alexander Campbell believed it. A member of the Methodist Church is not compelled, I believe, to accept the teachings of John Wesley, only as these have found places in the Methodist Discipline; so the members of the Christian Church are under no obligation to accept what Alexander Campbell has taught, only as it finds a place in their standard of faith and discipline, the Bible.

Q. Now, Mr. Carpenter, is it not true that Mr. Campbell is the founder of your Church, and that the members of it have been recognizing the authority of his writings? In the decision of questions relating to your ecclesiastical doctrines, has he not become the authority?

A. No, sir.

Q. Have not the Methodist Episcopal Church, and the Methodist Protestant Church, and the German Methodist Church—have not all these repudiated your actions since 1823, and declared that your Church was heterodox and not orthodox?

A. I do not know; and more, I am not very much concerned about it, for all of them combined can not establish a standard of orthodoxy. That standard is the true teaching of the Bible alone; God, by the inspiration of His Spirit, has established that standard, and by it we stand or fall.

Q. Do you know of a church considered as orthodox, since the organization of your first congregation in 1823, but what has considered you as not orthodox? And further: I will ask you if, in the whole known world, all orthodox people have not excluded your Church as not orthodox?

A. I will admit that in the early part of our history as a movement for the restoration of primitive Christianity, from 1823 subsequently, the

so-called orthodox denominations did not fall upon our necks in the attitude of affection and suffuse us with kisses—we had to fight or fall; but if that be evidence of our heterodoxy, then there is not an orthodox denomination in existence, for they have all had the same experience. At one time the Lutherans, the Presbyterians, the Baptists, the Methodists, the Quakers, and all, were held at arm's length.

Q. Well, are not all orthodox people different?

A. I am inclined to think that the self-asserted, so-called orthodox people are all different. Some of them set forth unconditional election, and others cry for a conditional salvation; some of them stand out for floods of water, and some of them contend for a few drops only; some of them hoot the idea of falling from grace, and others walk in mortal fear lest they have lost their hold; some of them are broad and liberal in their views, and some of them like to impale their victims on the poniard of heterodoxy. Yes, I am inclined to think that all orthodox people are different.

Q. Ah, ha! Have you ever read the Baptist work entitled "Campbellism Examined," and are you acquainted with its author, the Rev. Dr. J. B. Jeter?

A. Yes, sir; I have read the book, and have seen the author.

Q. It is a pamphlet, is it not?

A. It is a book.

Q. How?

A. It is a book of about four hundred pages, I think.

Q. Well, it has three hundred and sixty-nine pages exclusive of other matter. I will now ask you to state, sir, whether or not the Baptist Church of the State of Virginia did not refuse to fellowship with you on the ground that you were not orthodox?

A. I have no knowledge of such action.

Q. Do you not know that the Baptist Church in the State of Virginia, in the year 1852, passed the following resolution: "*Resolved*, That this Association [meaning the Baptist Association of the State of Virginia] can not conscientiously receive members and ministers from the Campbellite or Christian Church;" and that the Association refused to recognize your ministers in their ministerial meetings, when, at the same time, it received and recognized members of other churches as orthodox?

A. Not that I know of, sir. However, I was in the city of Richmond, Virginia, in the year 1876, attending the meetings of our General Missionary Convention, and Dr. Jeter attended the sessions of the Convention. He was interested in the meetings, and in an address made at one of the evening sessions, the Doctor said that he was very sorry that he did not know a good many years ago what he did then; for if he had, a good many

things that were written would not have been written, and a good many things done that would not have been done.

Q. Do you know, sir, that the Baptist Church ever rescinded that resolution against your Church?

A. I do not know anything about it; but I do know that the Baptist Church is very glad to receive our people into its fellowship whenever it has an opportunity, though the opportunity seldom comes; and that, too, when members of the Methodist Episcopal Church, of the Presbyterian Church, and of other churches, are not received unless they are immersed. I guess the Baptist folks like us pretty well.

Q. Do you know whether they do this because of your being immersed?

A. No, sir; I think not on that ground only.

Q. You think not?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Practically, your Church and the Baptist Church are the same, are they not?

A. No, sir; we are not.

Q. When was the Evangelical Alliance organized?

A. I do not know, sir; I am not able to tell the time.

Q. Do its members have to conform to any creed?

A. Well, none in particular, I believe. Probably what is known as the Apostles' Creed expresses what they hold in common.

Q. Well, is there any sentence in the creed that requires its members to be orthodox in belief?

A. My understanding is that they make the Apostles' Creed the test for membership. They may have some such statement of what is evangelical as the Young Men's Christian Association has. In the International Convention at Portland, 1869, that Association defined evangelical as follows: "And we hold those churches to be evangelical which, maintaining the Holy Scriptures to be the only infallible rule of faith and practice, do believe in the Lord Jesus Christ (the only begotten of the Father, King of kings, and Lord of lords, in whom dwelleth the fullness of the Godhead bodily, and who was made sin for us, though knowing no sin, bearing our sins in His own body on the tree), as the only name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved from everlasting punishment." (*Constitution Y. M. C. A.*) That expresses our position.

Q. Do you not know, as a matter of fact, that that article is not essential to orthodox belief—that the members of the Evangelical Alliance are required to be correct in the majority of orthodox requirements as a condition to membership?

A. I am not thoroughly informed as to the organization of the Evangelical Alliance, but I have no such understanding.

Reëxamination by the Counsel for the Plaintiff.

Q. Mr. Carpenter, I believe your attention has been called to an encyclopedia since you have been present here.

A. I have several encyclopedias in my library.

Q. Have you noticed the statements of the different doctrines or beliefs in them?

A. Yes, sir; I have.

Q. I will ask you——

A. I have had to look at the book several times.

Q. I will ask you if you remember this from the Library of Universal Knowledge——

(To this objection was made.)

Q. Well, I will ask you to state, Mr. Witness, whether or not your Church has been recognized and admitted as orthodox in its teaching and practice in any way.

A. It is my understanding that it has. And as far as I myself am concerned, I have never known an instance in which we were not so recognized. I have been in attendance at the general meetings and conventions of the different churches, union associations, the international Sunday-school conventions, etc., and I have never known it to be called in question.

Q. You may state whether or not in those meetings you were treated as the preachers of the other churches were treated.

A. Precisely so; there has been no difference, so far as I have been able to discover.

Q. You may state, sir, whether or not, when you have been present at the worship of any other church, say for instance the Methodist Episcopal, you have been invited to commune with them.

A. Yes, sir, I have been invited to commune with them, and have frequently done so.

Q. I will now ask you, do you invite the members of the Presbyterian, Methodist, Baptist, and other churches to commune with you?

A. Well, sir, the close communion Baptists do not commune with any one except those of "their own faith and order."

Q. Oh! well, I mean churches liberal in their communion and claiming to be orthodox.

A. Well, sir, we say that the table is the Lord's, and that all who are the children of the Lord have a right to a place at that table; and as the Scriptures enjoin each one to examine himself and so eat, we invite all who can honestly pass this self-examination to commune with us and celebrate with us the great event that brought redemption to the world; and thou-

sands of all these denominations have thus communed with us and brought to themselves spiritual good.

Q. Have you ever known any of the members of the Christian Church to be refused the communion by any of these churches, except by the close communion Baptists?

A. No, sir; but, on the other hand, they invite us.

Q. Have the writings of Alexander Campbell, or of any other man in the Disciples' or Christian Church, been adopted as its true doctrine and principles?

A. No, sir; the writings of Alexander Campbell are no more authoritative than my writings, or the writings of any other man; and no human production ever has or ever will be authoritative enough to become a standard—the Bible, and the Bible alone holds that place.

Q. You were asked whether or not a person, if he avowed things contrary to the main teaching of the gospel, would be allowed to remain in your Church. I now ask you, sir, whether or not a member, denying any of the cardinal doctrines or teachings generally recognized by Christians as the standard, would be permitted to remain in the Church?

A. Do you mean if he were to refuse to recognize them?

Q. I mean if he were to deny them.

A. No, sir; that man would not be recognized in the Church.

Q. Is it not true that the liberty of which you speak as being allowed to persons in the Church pertains only to the minor points, and not to the cardinal doctrines of the Christian Church?

A. The liberty of which I spoke pertains to those things which the Scriptures do not make necessary to salvation—to those things the acceptance and rejection of which will neither secure nor imperil salvation; but to those things to which the Scriptures ascribe salvation there is no turning away from them, neither to the right hand nor to the left. These are the matters of faith, and not of opinion. It is in opinions that we allow liberty.

Q. And you are liberal in respect of them?

A. We try to be.

Q. Mr. Baker labored a long time to get you to say that Alexander Campbell is the founder of the Christian Church. Does the Church so recognize him?

A. No, sir; the Church does not so recognize him or any other man, not even the Apostle Peter, though to him were given the keys of the kingdom of heaven.

Q. Is this not the teaching of your Church: that the original Church of Christ was first instituted on the day of Pentecost, by the Apostle Peter, acting under the authority of the Lord Jesus Christ through the inspira-

tion of the Spirit whom he sent on that day, as recorded in the Acts of Apostles, and that the members of that Church are called Christians?

A. That is a correct statement of its teaching upon that point.

Q. Is it not true, Mr. Witness, that you meant to be understood as saying that Christian persons, irrespective of where they are found, from the primitive Church on down to the present time, are members of Christ's Church, and not as members of any particular branch of any church?

A. That is what I said to the jury. The Church of Christ does not consist of ecclesiastical organization, so-called. The only organization known to the Scriptures is the local congregation, and that was organized, not to give membership in the Church of Christ, but to band together those who are members of His Church that they may mutually work out the great object of Christ's mission—the salvation of their souls. Hence, wherever there has been a genuine Christian, there has been a representative of the Church of Christ.

Q. What do you understand the relation to be which Alexander Campbell sustained to the Christian Church?

A. In the first place, it is understood by the Church that he was a member of the local congregation in Bethany, West Virginia, where he lived, and was an elder in it. In the second place, he is recognized as a distinguished man for his pulpit ability, his polemic power, his superior scholarship, and his inexhaustible resources as a writer, he having written a large number of volumes and published papers for a great many years; but notwithstanding the possession and recognition of these masterly qualities, he was only a humble member of the local congregation where he lived, with what authority the office of elder would give him in that congregation alone.

Q. I will ask you whether or not the restoration which Mr. Campbell and his coadjutors attempted, in 1823, was the establishment of any new church, and whether or not it gave any new styled theological doctrine different from the established principles of Christianity?

A. No, sir; he established no new church, and he put forth no new theory; but he contended for the restoration of primitive Christianity with the Church of Christ as it was then established, and in doing this he necessarily held debates and discussions with the ministers who represented the various churches and denominations, for the reason that if the primitive Church were restored in its simplicity much that had become incorporated in these churches would have to be thrown overboard, for they differ widely from the church described in the Bible.

Q. Is this one of them (holding up Campbell and Rice's Debate)?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. I will ask you if he held a discussion with Mr. Robert Owen, of Scotland, upon the evidences of Christianity?

A. Yes, sir, he did.

Q. Was that discussion published and circulated generally over the world?

A. It was published, and it has had a very general circulation, being found in nearly all the public and in a very great many private libraries.

Q. Where was that discussion held?

A. It was held in the city of Cincinnati, in April, 1829.

Q. Was it prior or subsequent to the debate with Mr. Rice?

A. It was several years prior, the debate with Mr. Rice being in November, 1843.

Q. Do you understand that, because Mr. Campbell held discussions with the ministers of other churches, he is therefore to be regarded as heterodox?

A. No, sir; for then are all heterodox.

Q. Is it not true, and has it not been so in all time past, that there have been discussions; and have not the ministers of the various churches debated among themselves?

A. I have known a great many discussions. The Baptists have held discussions; and all the other churches have done so among themselves, as well as with us.

Q. Do other churches hold discussions, too?

A. That is just what I was saying. I have known other churches to hold discussions as well as ours.

Q. Mr. Witness, you may state whether or not this Church, upon the main points essential to orthodoxy, is similar to the other so-called orthodox churches, as the Presbyterians, the Baptists, etc., etc.

A. I understand that it does not materially differ with them on those points—the differences are upon the minor points.

Q. Do you mean to say that because of those differences some are orthodox and some are not?

A. No, sir; I do not.

Q. I will ask you whether or not you understand the word orthodox, as applied to religious belief, means the doctrines generally taught in the Bible by the Lord Jesus Christ as essentially necessary to be believed that a person may be admitted into the Church of Christ?

A. I do, sir; together with those that are necessary to keep him in the Church after he is in.

Q. Does it mean anything else?

A. No, sir.

Q. That is all.

[Here the plaintiff rested.]

CHAPTER IX.

SECTION VI.

TESTIMONY BY REV. J. W. SMITH.

The Rev. J. W. Smith, being duly sworn to testify on behalf of the defendant, deposes as follows:

Examination in Chief.

Q. You may state your name to the court and jury.

A. My name is John W. Smith.

Q. You may state what your profession or calling is.

A. My calling is that of a minister in the Methodist Episcopal Church.

Q. How long have you been such a minister?

A. Ever since the year 1845.

Q. Whereabouts have you served as such minister, generally speaking?

A. Through Northeastern Indiana, the northeastern quarter of the State; and with some of the churches of the Northwestern Conference.

Q. You may state to the jury whether or not you have a knowledge of the church generally known as the Christian Church—it is sometimes called the Campbellite Church.

A. Yes, sir; I have a knowledge of the existence of that Church.

Q. Well, sir, you may state to the jury about how long you have had a knowledge of that Church—how long since your attention was called to it.

A. My attention was called to it in a very early period of my life—before I was a minister or directly afterwards—perhaps about the year 1833.

Q. Now, then, have you ever had occasion to learn the various phases of doctrine, belief, and practice of that Church? If so, state in what respect your attention has been called to them.

A. My attention was called to the doctrine or belief of that Church by hearing its ministers preach and by reading publications—books, pamphlets, periodicals, etc.—published by its members.

Q. You may now state what the fact is in this respect, whether or not you have given the matter such attention as would enable you to know and understand its doctrines and belief.

A. I think so, to a tolerable accuracy; I think I am correctly informed.

Q. Mr. Witness, I will now ask you to state to the jury whether or not this Church, in its doctrines and belief, is orthodox.

(To this question objection was made, but it was answered.)

A. The opinion which I have been led to form is that, in the generally accepted sense of the term "orthodox" or "orthodoxy," I have not regarded the teaching as a whole—the definite teaching by which that denomination is distinguished from the other denominations—as orthodox. I understand my opinion to be inquired for.

Cross-Examination by the Counsel for the Plaintiff.

Q. Mr. Smith, in what portion of the country was it that you came in contact with the Christian Church, and heard the ministers preach and teach their doctrines?

A. I do not know that I understand the entire question.

Q. You stated in your examination-in-chief that you had become acquainted with the doctrines or belief of the Christian or Disciples' Church, and that you had heard its ministers preach and had read its publications.

A. Yes, sir.

Q. In what portion of the country was it that you heard those ministers preach?

A. I have heard them preach in various portions and charges of the State where I have labored for any extended portion of time—at Marion, and at Alexandria, and in almost all of the places where I have labored or have had charges.

Q. Now, Mr. Smith, I understand you to say that in your opinion the Christian Church is not orthodox; am I right?

A. That is correct; that is, in the definite features by which it is distinguished from other denominations.

Q. That is, so far as it differs from other denominations it is not orthodox?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. What do you understand by the word "orthodoxy"?

A. I understand by that term "right opinion" or "correct opinion" in matters pertaining to Christianity as a faith in the Bible; or, in other words, the belief defining the doctrines of the Bible.

Q. Does not the etymology of the word—the Greek ὀρθός (*orthos*) and δόξα (*doxa*)—indicate that it means right teaching or right opinion?

A. Yes, sir; right teaching. The word δόξα (*doxa*), I understand, has come to mean opinion or belief.

Q. I will ask you if the word δόξα (*doxa*) is not derived from the word δοκεῖν (*dokein*), meaning to think?

A. I understand it to be derived from δοξάζω (*doxazo*), meaning to believe or esteem.

Q. To believe or esteem?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. You say it is not derived from δοκεῖν (*dokein*)?

A. I think not, directly.

Q. What is the definition given by Webster of the word "orthodox" or "orthodoxy"?

A. If I recollect correctly, Webster defines it as right opinion in matters pertaining to religion. That is my recollection—I do not claim to have the exact phraseology.

Q. You are substantially correct. You mean religious doctrine, to make it correspond with the definition by Webster?

A. Yes, sir; that is my understanding of orthodoxy.

Q. Now, Mr. Smith, do you think there must be a unanimity in all matters of opinion in order that there be an orthodoxy? Or, if not, what opinions are essential to the doctrines of orthodoxy?

A. The word orthodoxy surely implies, as it is used in its modern sense, things different from what it does in its complete application. The word orthodox, as it is used in this complete application, would require the correct opinion in every particular—correct in the ordinary and correct in the general acceptation.

Q. (By the defendant.) In all things?

A. But in the general acceptation of orthodoxy, so far as it relates to these things, it is not necessary to include the minor points, upon which there may be some difference. At least there is a difference of opinion in the churches.

Q. What do you say, Mr. Smith: Is the Wesleyan Creed, in the main, considered orthodox?

A. So far as that goes. That creed does not specify, if I recollect.

Q. And that Church adopted the Apostles' Creed as its statement of belief. Would you not call the Apostles' Creed orthodox?

A. As far as it extends.

Q. Well, what would be the difference from the Apostles' Creed?

A. There was a difference—well, there was a difference in the cardinal—in the cardinal points. The doctrine of a great and all-creative Being, coupled with the other, is sound doctrine.

Q. Well, now, suppose you state what doctrines can be drawn from the Apostles' Creed which can be considered as sound doctrine.

A. Have you the place?

Q. "I believe in God the Father almighty, maker of heaven and earth." That is sound doctrine, is it not?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. "I believe in Jesus Christ God's only Son, our Lord; which was

conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary, suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, dead, and buried; he descended into hell; the third day he rose again from the dead; he ascended into heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of God the Father almighty; from thence he shall come to judge the quick and the dead." Would you call that sound doctrine?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. "I believe in the Holy Ghost; the holy catholic church; the communion of saints; the forgiveness of sins; the resurrection of the body; and the life everlasting." Now, what do you think of the church that believes that, and accepts it? Do you consider that an orthodox statement of belief?

A. Yes, sir; so far as it goes.

Q. What of this: "The Spirit is said to do, and to have done, all that God does and all that God has done. It has ascribed to it all divine perfections and works; and in the New Testament it is designated as the immediate author and agent of the new creation, and of the holiness of Christians. It is, therefore, called *the Holy Spirit.* In the sublime and ineffable relation of the deity, or godhead, it stands next to the Incarnate Word. Anciently, or before time, it *was* GOD, the WORD of God, and the SPIRIT of God. But now, in the development of the Christian scheme, *it is* 'the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit'—one God, one Lord, one Spirit. To us Christians there *is*, then, but one God, even the Father, and one Lord Jesus Christ, even the Saviour; and one Spirit, even the Advocate, the Sanctifier, and the Comforter of Christ's body—the church. Jesus is the *head*, and the Spirit is the *life* and animating principle of that body"? (*Christian System, p. 24.*)

A. I do not understand the passage.

Q. "To us Christians there *is*, then, but one God, even the Father, and one Lord Jesus Christ, even the Saviour; and one Spirit, even the Advocate, the Sanctifier, and the Comforter of Christ's body—the church. Jesus is the *head*, and the Spirit is the *life* and animating principle of that body." Now, you have it again; do you understand it?

A. There is a difference between that expression and the matter as it is expressed in the gospel.

Q. Well, but so far as that statement is concerned you think it is orthodox, do you not?

A. In the sense that the gospel is the means by which God has placed the sinner in such situation that he can repent of his sins and come to salvation and be blessed by the Holy Spirit in this life—in that sense it is orthodox.

Q. There can be but one sense—there can be but one meaning of the expression, can there?

A. If you request the exact import of that expression, I would say that there is a variety of meanings among the churches—the term gospel is not always considered as meaning the same.

Q. Well, Mr. Smith, if a brother come into the church and believe your doctrine, so far as that is concerned he is orthodox, is he not?

(To this question objection was made, but it was answered.)

Q. How is that Mr. Smith?

A. I think it is necessary that a man believe in the Divine Being, as set forth in the Apostles' Creed, and of course he must believe in the Bible, in order to come into the Church of Christ.

Q. I desire to call your attention, and ask you if that is the explanation you would make?

A. I should regard that as the faith that is necessary to have, a faith in the Divine Being.

Q. Have you given a definite statement of the doctrines of faith that are necessary for a person to believe in order to come into your Church?

A. If the meaning I have given is not misapplied.

Q. I ask you again if you have done it?

A. If I have?

Q. Yes, sir.

A. If I understand it, I have no objection to this liberal thought or statement of belief: I believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, that he suffered and died, or was sacrificed upon the cross, and that we are to live in the way of His commandments, lead a new life, repent of our sins, and turn to God.

Q. And you require a person to be orthodox?

A. Yes, sir; that is, a faith in all his transactions in all things.

Q. Do you think it necessary to have a faith in all the theological dogmas that a man may become a church member?

A. I say that in the main he must be correct.

Q. Now, Mr. Smith, I want you to tell us in what the Christian Church is not orthodox—what particular doctrines you regard as being not orthodox——

A. In my own opinion——

Q. You have already stated that you do not regard the members of the Christian Church as being orthodox in regard to their doctrines. You were asked to give your opinion, and you said that you think their doctrines are not orthodox. Now, will you have the kindness to state to the jury wherein you think they are not orthodox?

A. That is, wherein I consider they are not orthodox?

Q. Yes, sir.

A. In the first place, there is a difference in regard to the doctrine of the three personages in the Godhead—the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. That, I think, is essential to the correct idea of the Divine Being. The belief of His existence is essential, and that there are three divine beings, or personages; that these continue to exist in union—inseparable union, and not distinct—each as a divine personage, but united and inseparable in form and eternity, and that He exists in these relations. In the Scriptures the divinity is designated by the term Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. Now, the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit comprise the Trinity, and they are eternal—in that existence as Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, they are one eternal Godhead. This is the meaning of the term when we speak of it. The Christian Church believes that these personages are not equal, and in this respect it is not orthodox. As to the Holy Spirit being a personage, it believes that He is not equal in existence—coequal—with the Father; that is, He is not coequal with the Father in existence.

Q. Mr. Smith——

A. That is, on the ground as I stated the personages of the Trinity.

Q. Well, inasmuch as you have now given your opinion upon that point, I desire to call your attention, if you please, to this paragraph:

A. Very well.

Q. Now, Mr. Smith, do you consider this a correct statement: "The Holy Spirit and the Son is one in substance with the Father"? Is that statement orthodox?

A. Yes, sir; that is a correct statement, I think.

Q. Now, if the Christian Church believes in the three personages, in a plurality in the Godhead, do you not say that it is correct in that item? Mr. Smith, is it not true that ever since the great controversy of 1843 it has been understood that the Christian Church believes there is a plurality in the Godhead? and is it not, therefore, orthodox in its belief on the Trinity?

A. I will ask you to make the last statement you made again.

Q. Oh! yes, sir. Is it not true that ever since the great controversy of 1843 it has been understood that the Christian Church believes there is a plurality in the Godhead? and is it not, therefore, orthodox in its belief on the Trinity? Is not that good trinitarian doctrine, that there are three divine personages which are one?

A. Yes, sir; those two statements you have made are very nearly correct.

Q. Now, Mr. Smith, I will ask you if all that is not good, sound trinitarianism?

A. There is no great difference of opinion as thus stated; but so far as that is concerned, at the same time the Christian Church may believe substantially the doctrines which are taught by all trinitarians, yet it may

be said that there is no distinction, no important distinction, made by the Church in relation to these personages.

Q. Yes, sir; that is, Mr. Smith, your idea is that they are heretical because of their belief, and not because of any particular expression of their belief? I will ask you to state whether or not you would make this a test of orthodoxy.

A. It is not fully particularized.

Q. What is there in orthodox doctrine upon that subject?

A. We think that a person should believe in God and the unity of the Godhead; that they are made manifest merely by the Spirit, and that it sustains certain relations to redemption. But there are certain attributes of the Divine Being: that He is eternal; that He existed and continues to exist through all eternity; that He manifests His Spirit as Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. There is, as I have often observed, the same properties with respect to each—that each has a distinct existence as Father, Son, and Holy Spirit; and he that admits that theory is sound to the bottom. All must acquiesce in these things, for they make us wise unto salvation. All must believe in the Trinity, and worship it, for this is necessary to salvation. All must believe in a divine and eternal existence in the one Godhead, and he that does not believe this is not orthodox.

Q. That is, that there are three personages?

A. Yes, sir; that there are three personages and, as I understand it, that these personages have a continuous existence.

Q. Now, do you say that the Christian Church does not believe that doctrine?

A. I do not understand them to so teach by those different men whom I have heard preach.

Q. Do you intend to testify, Mr. Smith, that the Christian Church does not believe there are three personages, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit?

A. As I am informed, I do not understand them to teach it. So far as I have heard their teaching and preaching, I have been led to think and understand that they are not orthodox in their teaching in this respect.

Q. Well, now, I will ask you, to quicken your memory—I will ask you whether or not you pretend to say that the Christian Church does not believe in one Godhead?

A. I have not been able to understand it so.

Q. Will you say that they do not believe it, Mr. Smith?

A. So far as I understand their teaching, I think they do not.

Q. Do n't they? What do you mean by their teaching?

A. I mean what their preachers and their people say.

Q. Please name them—some of them whom you have heard preach that doctrine.

A. My recollection of names is not very accurate. I think Mr. Ben Franklin preached that, as well as other ministers of that denomination. I do not readily recall to recollection the names of the different persons—I am unable to do it.

Q. I will ask you, Mr. Smith, whether or not you have ever heard Benjamin Franklin say that in any of his preaching, or preach the doctrine denying the three personages in the Godhead?

A. Not in terms.

Q. Not in terms?

A. No, sir.

Q. Now, I do not know whether or not you mean to imply that he did in some other way.

A. Only impliedly speaking. I think he said in his preaching that the Holy Spirit, in its operations, was a separate and distinct being; or, at least, his preaching gave his hearers that impression. I do not recollect the statement exactly, but the statement was to that amount.

Q. Now, Mr. Smith, what do you say to this: "The revelation of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit is no more clear and distinct than are the different offices assumed and performed by these glorious and ineffable three in the present affairs of the universe. It is true, so far as unity of design and concurrence of action is contemplated, they coöperate in every work of creation, providence, and redemption. Such is the concurrence expressed by the Messiah in these words: 'My Father worketh hitherto, and I work;' 'I and my Father are one;' 'Whatsoever the Father doeth, the Son doeth likewise:' but not such a concurrence as annuls personality, impairs or interferes with the distinct offices of each in the salvation of men"? (*Campbell and Rice, p. 616.*) Now, Mr. Smith, what fault have you to find with that doctrine? Have you any exceptions to take to it?

A. No, sir. Wherein it relates to Christians and the ingrafted members of the Church of Christ, of course there is no fault—I say no.

Q. Now, how is it in regard to the personal agency of the Holy Spirit? You have stated that you have no fault to find with the foregoing statement wherein it speaks of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. Now, as to the personal agency of the Holy Spirit, I will ask you if you have any fault to find with the following expression: "I would not, sir, value at the price of a single mill the religion of any man, as respects the grand affair of eternal life, whose religion is not begun, carried on, and completed by the personal agency of the Holy Spirit. Nay, sir, I esteem it the peculiar excellence and glory of our religion, that it is *spiritual;* that the soul of a man is quickened, enlightened, sanctified, and consoled by the indwelling presence of the Spirit of the eternal God. But, while avowing these my convictions, I have no more fellowship with those false

and pernicious theories that confound the peculiar work of the Father with that of the Son, or with that of the Holy Spirit, or the work of any of these awful names with that of another; or which represents our illumination, conversion, and sanctification as the work of the Spirit without the knowledge, belief, and obedience of the gospel, as written by the holy apostles and evangelists, than I have with the author and finisher of the book of Mormon"? (*Campbell and Rice, p. 616.*) What do you say to that statement?

A. The statement, taken alone, is unbiblical, so far as I am able to ascertain.

Q. That is, so far as the personal agency of the Spirit is concerned, the statement is unbiblical?

A. It seems to denote that.

Q. Only the words, as they were quoted, do as a matter of fact convey unbiblical doctrine; or would you take exception to the distinction made between the Father and Son?

A. No, sir; I do not know that I would, because nobody denies the personal distinction between the Father and the Son in that sense.

Q. Now, then, Mr. Smith, is that not an exceptionally strong statement of the personalty of the three personages in the Godhead? Is not that conception of the Godhead orthodox?

A. To this I would say: Taken alone, without any additional statement or explanation—without an explanation of these statements—I say it would be.

Q. Now, Mr. Smith, that is the teaching of the Christian Church; what do you say to it? But I will go on: "For example, the Father sends the Son, and not the Son the Father. The Father provides a body and a soul for his Son, and not the Son for his Father. The Son offers up that body and soul for sin, and thus expiates it, which the Father does not, but accepts it. The Father and the Son send forth the Spirit, and not the Spirit either. The Spirit now advocates Christ's cause, and not Christ his own cause. The Holy Spirit now animates the church with his presence, and not Christ himself. He is the Head of the church, while the Spirit is the heart of it. The Father originates all, the Son executes all, the Spirit consummates all. Eternal volition, design, and mission belong to the Father; reconciliation to the Son; sanctification to the Spirit." (*Campbell and Rice, p. 616.*) Now, is n't that sound?

A. The last three expressions are not.

Q. "Eternal violition, design, and mission belong to the Father; reconciliation to the Son; sanctification to the Spirit"?

A. Yes, sir; those statements are such as I would not accept.

Q. Well, now——

A. Just those statements taken alone.

Q. Now, Mr. Smith, I will ask you if the Christian Church does not believe that doctrine and teach it?

A. That does not agree with the lectures I have heard made by the ministers in that denomination. I must answer that there is quite a difference.

Q. I will ask you, sir, does not the Christian Church indorse that doctrine, accepting all of it?

A. I am not able to say as to that.

Q. Will you say that it does not accept it?

A. I am not prepared to say they do not; but so far as I have been able to gather their opinions from their sermons and the articles which I have read, and from the press under their control, I have been otherwise impressed with the teaching of the Church. I think it does not actually accept that doctrine as true.

Q. Mr. Smith, do you not know that Alexander Campbell accepted that doctrine?

A. Well, there is—well, there is not hardly——

Q. Mr. Smith, that is Alexander Campbell's own language.

A. But culled out.

Q. Is that a matter for you to say?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Now, wait and I will give you a statement of the doctrine: "'He has saved us,' says the Apostle Paul, 'by the bath of regeneration and the *renewing of the Holy Spirit*, which he poured on us richly through Jesus Christ our Saviour; that being justified by his favor [in the bath of regeneration], we might be made heirs according to the hope of eternal life.' Thus, and not by works of righteousness, he has saved us. Consequently, being born of water and the renewing of the Holy Spirit are not works of merit or of righteousness, but only the means of enjoyment. But this pouring out of the influence, this renewing of the Holy Spirit, is as necessary as the bath of regeneration to the salvation of the soul, and to the enjoyment of the hope of heaven, of which the Apostle speaks. In the kingdom into which we are born of water, the Holy Spirit is as the atmosphere in the kingdom of nature; we mean that the influences of the Holy Spirit are as necessary to *the new life*, as the atmosphere is to our animal life in the kingdom of nature. All that is done in us before regeneration, God our Father effects by *the word*, or the gospel as dictated and confirmed by his Holy Spirit. But after we are thus begotten and born by the Spirit of God—after our new birth—the Holy Spirit is shed on us richly through Jesus Christ our Saviour; of which the peace of mind, the love, the joy, and the hope of the regenerate is full proof; for these are

among the fruits of that Holy Spirit of promise of which we speak." (*Christian System, p. 267.*) What do you think of that statement?

A. Oh! yes, that is scriptural; I have no objection to that; it is scriptural and orthodox. Whenever you quote from the Bible of course we will accept that.

Q. Now, Mr. Smith, if we were to take forty, or fifty, or seventy-five members of your own Church, how many of them, I will ask you, would define this doctrine of the Trinity as you do, and make the distinctions which you make?

A. Oh! if I were to answer that, it would only be the introduction of my opinion into this testimony.

Q. Mr. Smith, do you pretend to understand the doctrine of the Trinity?

A. I do not pretend to know all about it, but there is a distinction, I think, which a great many fail to make—there are a great many who fail to comprehend the subject.

Q. But Mr. Campbell claimed in his writings that these ineffable relations may be apprehended by nearly all, and at the same time comprehended by none.

A. That is very true.

Q. Now, Mr. Smith, do you wish this jury to understand—do you pretend to say—that because the Christian Church may not believe the doctrine of the Trinity just as you have stated it, and as probably three-fourths of your own people do not believe it, the denomination is not orthodox?

A. I have not been led, as I said before—I have not been led to conclude that it is.

Q. If it believes that doctrine, what have you to say to it then?

A. This particular expression which you have pointed out may have the same meaning—it may mean substantially the same thing—the Church may believe these theological doctrines just as they have been expounded and explained by the counsel, but of course I can not tell.

Q. And you say these forms of expression are mere theories?

A. The full and usual meaning of the expression is the existence of three personages in the Godhead.

Q. In other words, they speak the doctrine of the Trinity but they do not believe it. Is that it?

A. They seem to believe the main features to a great extent as to the formulated part. There are churches that, with that explanation and expression of the doctrines of the Trinity, receive it—indeed all those churches which pretend to be orthodox believe these doctrines of the Trinity.

Q. Mr. Smith, is not that statement a restatement in other words of the definition of the doctrine as it is found in the Methodist Discipline?

A. There are the rules which are found in all our church disciplines.

Q. Is a church that believes these doctrines orthodox or not?

A. Yes, sir; I mean that a church that believes these doctrines is orthodox—I mean to say that a church and the membership of a church that believe these doctrines, and what I have said about, and what is in the Discipline, I would accept as orthodox.

Q. Yes, sir?

A. I think so far as the membership of the Christian Church differ from these doctrines, they are unsound. A man is unsound if he impart a certain formulated doctrine and that doctrine does not correspond with the doctrine I have given you; in other words, if he does not believe in the unity of the Godhead, he is unsound.

Q. Oh! yes, if a man expects to be orthodox, he must believe both the unity and trinity of the Godhead. Now, suppose a man wants to become a member of your Church, the Methodist Episcopal Church—if he wants to be admitted into your Church—would you admit him without a previous change of heart?

A. He should believe the doctrine pertaining to the Trinity as it has been stated; then, relying upon the truth of his statement as to a change of heart, of course I would admit him into the Church.

Q. You would read the Discipline to him, and question him on that particular phase of doctrine, and if he said he believed it, as you requested him to do, you would admit him into your Church and call him orthodox?

A. Yes, sir; so far as that branch of the case is concerned.

Q. Now, then, Mr. Smith, I understand you to say that the Discipline is a definite statement of the doctrine as it is. Am I right?

A. Not a statement, only so far as we have authorities for our rules.

Q. I know, Mr. Smith, that you do not incorporate all the theological rules, but you incorporate the fundamental principles in the Discipline, do you not?

A. Oh! certainly; our Discipline as I understand it expresses the rules that are found elsewhere.

Q. Not a succinct explanation of the truth, but sufficient to admit a person into the Church as orthodox?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Now, Mr. Smith, that is one point of difference between the Christian Church and the so-called orthodox churches? What is another that you would indicate.

A. The next point that occurs to me is this: The Christian Church,

or the so-called Christian Church, does not correspond with the other churches in their teaching—in their teaching that Church says that the sinner must save himself—must save himself by his own voluntary act, and not by the operation of the Spirit—and not by the operation of the Holy Spirit.

Q. Do you testify to this jury that that is the doctrine of the Christian Church?

A. It is, as I understand it.

Q. What writer in the Christian Church has ever expressed that doctrine? You say you have read something of that.

A. I can not now turn to the particular passage, or cite the particular author to whom I refer, more than to the preachers or ministers to whom I have listened and who have made such an exposition of it. And I have, too, read articles in their journals which taught the doctrine that the sinner is influenced by the Word without the Spirit; that is, representing the Word as being the terms or means of Salvation. But, as I understand it, the sinner is furnished with the means to reformation and repentance. (We recognize the divine influence of the Spirit in producing this result, that the sinner must have this application of the Spirit to change him to a new life. The application of the Spirit gives him faith and changes him to a new life.) Then by his faith he resolves to do, he obeys the commandments of God, and his sins are stricken out; but this obedience of the sinner is by the influence of the truth. As I understand it, he thus obeys the commandments and turns to God by his confession and obedience. As I understand it, it is under the influence of these manifestations that God pardons his sins, and he is thereby brought into Christian relationship, is strengthened in his faith, and is brought under the direct influence of the divine manifestations—is brought into communion with God's Spirit, and is in charge of the Spirit as revealed by His divine will. This is what I understand to be the teaching of that Church through what I have read. I do not claim to have read all the articles.

Q. Mr. Smith, tell me a minister whom you have heard preach that doctrine.

A. Well, I have heard Mr. Franklin preach that doctrine.

Q. How long ago?

A. He preached it in Alexandria, in the year 1878, I believe.

Q. Four or five years ago?

A. I think it has been that long probably; I am not sure.

Q. In Alexandria, Michigan?

A. In Alexandria in this State, in Madison County.

Q. Have you ever heard any other preacher preach that doctrine?

A. What did you say?

Q. Have you ever heard any other preacher preach that doctrine?

A. I have heard another one also.

Q. Whom?

A. There was another preacher of that denomination whom I heard preach at Alexandria during my ministry there. I had a conversation with another minister of that denomination. It was Mr. ——, the preacher was a stranger to me; I would not know him by sight.

Q. Hopkins?

A. Hopkins, Hopkins; yes, sir, I have had a conversation with him upon that subject since I heard the other preacher, and I remember his conversation upon that subject, although it has been a long time.

Q. Well, now, what articles have you read?

A. I believe I can not cite the articles I have read—I have not given so much attention to the articles as the reading—I do not remember the volumes nor the author; but I have formed that opinion from their ministers and the articles which I have read. I have been led to believe that that is the doctrine of the Church.

Q. Mr. Smith, I will ask you if you heard the testimony of Mr. Chapman?

A. Whom?

Q. You heard Mr. Chapman testify upon this subject, and Mr. Edwards, and Mr. Carpenter, and Mr. Owen, did you not?

A. In part.

Q. I will ask you if you heard any such doctrine as that to which you have testified to-day in those testimonies?

A. I do not know as I heard any of those gentlemen testify—I do not know—I heard a part of their testimony upon that subject.

Q. Did they not distinctly state that it is the Holy Spirit that operates upon the heart of the sinner through the Word? Did they not distinctly state that it is necessary for the heart of a sinner to be influenced by the Holy Spirit in order for him to become a true Christian?

A. I understood these gentlemen to testify that the influence of the Holy Spirit is exerted upon the heart of a man in the same way that the truth operates upon the heart; that the Spirit operates upon the hearts of men in regard to their conduct in the same way that the truth operates and influences their feelings; that, in its manifestations upon persons, it operates by the same rules and in the same way that the truth operates upon the heart of the sinner; that the Spirit would have no efficacy upon the heart but for the operation of the truth upon it: that it could not exert any influence upon the heart of a sinner but for the truth. But I can not express this influence upon the heart through the medium of the truth in other words. As I understand them to testify, the Spirit operates through

the truth, and that the truth operates upon the conscience by the manifestation of the Spirit upon the conscience and judgment of the sinner, and in consequence of this influence the sinner obeys and becomes a Christian. This is the way I understand them to testify.

Q. They did n't say that, did they?

A. Oh! no, sir; but I am informed that they expressed it in other words. From what I gather, I take that to be their teaching.

Q. Do they not believe and definitely state that the Spirit operates upon the hearts of men, and dwells in the hearts of Christians?

A. Through the truth, and through it only.

Q. Well, now, do you pretend to say that the Spirit operates upon the hearts of men only independent of the truth—that it operates upon your own heart in that manner? Do you say that the Spirit does it independent of the Word; that it has no connection with the Word, but is independent in its operations?

A. Through the Spirit come the intuitions of the Word; and His abiding presence in the hearts of men is accompanied by the Word. In the same way the expression of the Word conveys conviction to the hearts of men.

Q. Do they not teach that the Spirit of God and its influence live and dwell in the hearts of men and cause the incorruptible seed to spring up unto eternal life? Let me read: "There yet remains another school, which never speculatively separates the Word and the Spirit; which, in every case of conversion, contemplates them as coöperating; or, which is the same thing, conceives of the Spirit of God as clothed with the gospel motives and arguments—enlightening, convincing, persuading sinners, and thus enabling them to flee from the wrath to come. In this school, conversion and regeneration are terms indicative of a moral or spiritual change—of a change accomplished through the arguments, the light, the love, the grace of God expressed and revealed, as well as approved by the supernatural attestations of the Holy Spirit. They believe, and teach, that it is the Spirit that quickens, and that the Word of God—the living Word—is that incorruptible seed, which, when planted in the heart, vegetates, and germinates, and grows, and fructifies unto eternal life." (*Campbell and Rice, p. 614.*) Is not that a correct statement of the Bible doctrine upon that subject?

A. I would regard that as being somewhat complex.

Q. Will you please make it more simple?

A. I would say that my explanation of that thought is this, that the Spirit is the source of truth.

Q. You certainly do not interpret it correctly. I will ask you to give a more definite expression of the operation of the Spirit than is given in

the few words I have read; but let me continue the paragraph: "They hold it to be unscriptural, irrational, unphilosophic, to discriminate between spiritual agency and instrumentality—between what the Word, *per se*, or the Spirit, *per se*, severally does; as though they were two independent, and wholly distinct powers, or influences. They object not to the coöperation of secondary causes; of various subordinate instrumentalities; the ministry of men; the ministry of angels; the doctrine of special providences; but, however, whenever the Word gets into the heart—the spiritual seed into the moral nature of man—it as naturally, as spontaneously grows there, as the sound, good corn, when deposited in the genial earth. It has life in it; and is, therefore, sublimely and divinely called 'The living and effectual Word.'" (*Campbell and Rice, p. 614.*) Now, sir, I will ask you to give a more certain and definite expression of the Spirit's work upon the moral nature of man than is thus given in this paragraph.

A. I will ask you if you wish me to state what effect it has in the conversion of the soul?

Q. (By the Court.) The counsel asks you to give your explanation of the operation.

A. Well, I will endeavor to give it as near as possible. I understand that the Spirit is sent not only to inspire the Word of truth, but also when that Word of truth is conveyed to the sinner and he is influenced by the gospel, it manifests itself upon the conscience rendering it susceptible of the influence of that truth; and that when a man is in his depraved nature he is insusceptible to the influence of the truth—it is the Spirit that renders the mind, and soul, and heart susceptible to the influence of that truth; that this truth, when a man is thus influenced by the Spirit, operates upon the mind with the Spirit, and renders his soul susceptible and brings him to obedience; and that by these influences of the truth and the Spirit, the truth operating upon the sinner through the direct operation of the Spirit upon the soul thus explaining the Word, he is brought into communication with the divine Spirit.

Q. I will now ask you to state to the jury that you understand that to be orthodox doctrine.

A. I understand this to be orthodox, that the personage of the Spirit operates through the truth, that the inspired truth thus results in bringing the sinner into fellowship, and that he is kept in that fellowship through the efficacy and the direct personal influence of the Spirit upon the soul and heart.

Q. Now, Mr. Smith, is that a better statement than what you say the Christian Church believes or claims to believe? It is a correct and definite statement to say that the Spirit quickens, is it not?

A. Well, that depends upon the word *quickens*. It is if the word has its ordinary meaning—I should take it in its literal sense.

Q. The Christian Church believes and teaches, "that it is the Spirit that quickens, and that the Word of God—the Living Word—is that incorruptible seed, which, when planted in the heart, vegetates, and germinates, and grows, and fructifies unto eternal life." Now, do n't you think that that statement is correct; do n't you believe it is a correct assertion?

A. I should say that it is what takes place through the operation of the Spirit upon the heart in the conversion—in the conversion of the sinner.

Q. Well, Mr. Smith, I will call your attention to the following as to the manner in which the Holy Spirit produces a true faith: "No new faculties are imparted—no old faculty destroyed. They are neither more nor less in number; they are neither better nor worse in kind. Paul the Apostle, and Saul of Tarsus, are the same person, so far as all the animal, intellectual, and moral powers are concerned. His mental and physical temperaments were just the same after as before he became a Christian. The Spirit of God, in effecting this great change, does not violate, metamorphose, or annihilate any power or faculty of the man, in making the saint. He merely receives new ideas, and new impressions, and undergoes a great moral or spiritual change—so that he becomes alive wherein he was dead, and dead wherein he was formerly alive." (*Campbell and Rice, p. 617.*) Again: "Now, as faith in God is the first principle—the soul-renewing principle of religion; as it is the regenerating, justifying, sanctifying principle; without it, it is impossible to be acceptable to God. With it, a man is a son of Abraham, a son of God; an heir apparent to eternal life—an everlasting kingdom. And what is Christian faith? It is the belief of testimony. It is a persuasion that God is true; that the gospel is divine; that God is love; that Christ's death is the sinner's life. It is trust in God. It is a reliance upon his truth, his faithfulness, his power. It is not merely a cold assent to the truth, to testimony: but a cordial, joyful consent to it, and reception of it. Still it is dependent on testimony. No testimony, no faith. The Spirit of God gave the testimony first. It bore witness to Jesus. It expected no faith without something to believe. Something to believe is always presented to faith; and that something must be heard before it can be believed; for, until it is heard, it is as though it were not—a nonentity. But it is not enough, that it be heard by the outward ear. God has given to man an inward, as well as an outward ear. The outward recognizes sounds only; the inward recognizes sense. Faith is, therefore, impossible without language; and, consequently, without the knowledge of language, and that language under-

stood. It is neither necessary nor possible, without language—intelligible language." (*Campbell and Rice, pp. 618, 619.*) Now, sir, is not that a correct statement as to the manner in which the gospel produces a true faith?

A. The statement gives the whole a different explanation; sometimes it might be taken as including the works generally concerning duties in life, and sometimes it might be taken as including the direct and specific operations of the Spirit upon the soul, and the influence upon the mind and heart; and then there is——

Q. You do n't think that that statement is enough?

A. No, sir.

Q. You do n't?

A. No, sir.

Q. That is an article upon the Holy Spirit. Now, do you profess to be able to give a better explanation of the work of the Holy Spirit in producing a true faith than this which refers the production of this end to the Spirit through the gospel? Or do you think that that is a "little complex"?

A. That expression?

Q. Yes, sir; too complex to be orthodox doctrine?

A. What work is that? I think that, in my own language, I would not express it in that way. I think the doctrine, as it is expressed, is not sound evangelical doctrine. I believe I would formulate the expression differently—as it is first given, it is unbiblical; of course it is in the expression.

Q. You think it is not correct?

A. Of course that is the explanation I would give from what I have read.

Q. And you think it is "too complex"?

A. Well, sir, in the main points, I think it is.

Q. You think it is "somewhat complex," and that it is hardly a sufficiently definite statement?

A. It might be understood as being insufficient in one sense. I think, in a certain signification, it is too complex. I suppose, if they understood it more perfectly themselves, these persons might define the expression of their faith upon it.

Q. Mr. Smith, you have been wrestling with orthodoxy, or right doctrine as you call it. I will now seriously ask you if you think this doctrine, as you have explained it, can be understood by the several members of a church—if a common man can understand it. Do you think a majority of the members—do you think that you could find one in a hundred of the laymen who can even state that doctrine, that orthodox doctrine?

A. Well, we do not expect the body of the laymen to do it.

Q. Then a common man, or a layman, can not understand it? Do you think the common people, the laymen, can understand such doctrine?

A. Oh! it is only the definite points of orthodoxy—only the definite points are aimed to be understood by the common mind.

Q. Now, in connection with the statement which you have given of what you conceive to be orthodox, I want you to answer me this: Is it necessary for a person to conceive the different points of orthodoxy, those points of orthodoxy which you have made in your statement of the principles involved in your different answers, in order that he become a Christian and a member of the church; is it necessary for a man to be capable of comprehending all the principles and differences, all the distinctions of the theory of orthodoxy, which you have made—is it necessary to understand all these distinctions of orthodoxy and properly comprehend them in order to become a Christian?

A. I think, to a certain degree, a Christian should understand them to have faith in them.

Q. Then, if he is to comprehend and understand all these things, the doctrine is not so plain that a wayfaring man, though a fool, may not err therein?

A. It is so plain that a man may understand it.

Q. The Bible says: "And an highway shall be there, and a way, and it shall be called, The way of holiness; the unclean shall not pass over it; but it shall be for those: the wayfaring men, though fools, shall not err therein." (Isaiah xxxv. 8.)

A. I do not know that my answer implies what your question involves.

Q. Well, sir, I ask you if the way is as plain as that? Do you say that the New Testament is not a guide for every person, laymen or no layman; that every one may not read it and be profited by it, indeed that every one may not obtain thereby the way to eternal life?

A. My impression is that, in the main, it can be understood—perhaps not all the rules and theories that are necessary to orthodoxy, yet the theories in the main should be understood; but all the theological expositions would not necessarily have to be understood. Many persons require instruction upon those points—that is what I mean.

Q. Then, Mr. Smith, a denomination of Christians can not be orthodox until it understands the right doctrine. Which one of all the denominations is orthodox, for they all differ the one from the other? You say that it must have an understanding of all these distinctions, and accept them, to be orthodox; which one does? And the laymen of the congregation must understand and accept these things?

A. I do not say that every layman must understand these things so that he can give a complete interpretation of them.

Q. How is this: The Bible says that the way is so plain that a fool shall not err therein; but what you say is orthodox doctrine is so intricate and complex that even the wisest men are puzzled to understand it, to say nothing of the common man?

A. I do not think I said it was so complex that it required an explanation, and that a common layman can not understand it. The main distinction upon the subject of orthodoxy, a common man can understand—that is, the main questions may be understood by the common man. How is that?

Q. I understand you to say that a mere common man can not understand the doctrine of orthodoxy, so as to have a clear understanding of it. Now, I ask you, do you want now to be understood as saying that a layman can understand and comprehend it fully?

A. I do not remember of making the statement. I may possibly have said that only the preachers might comprehend it. I meant it to be understood in that way—that is the way I understand it. Now, I think this is sufficient to define orthodoxy so far as my knowledge goes upon the subject. In relation to the fact that in the conversion of an ordinary man he can not understand and comprehend the terms and expressions of orthodoxy, that the common man is not able to understood it, or, as you before said, the wayfaring man can not comprehend it, I would remark that the standard of orthodoxy—or at least what I mean to say is the standard of orthodoxy is not to be so estimated. What we teach is this, that a man may understand the fundamental features, although he be not a cultured man. Any one who is able to understand the source of truth is able to understand it. If we are to estimate orthodoxy by what a certain member is able to comprehend, we can hardly have the truth in the highest sense. We might as well try to have the truth to conform to a man's capabilities who is not able to understand truth in all its phases. I take it that it would still remain truth; and so it is not necessary to believe in all the truth in order to be orthodox. A person may be orthodox in the substantial doctrines, and yet not understand nor be able to define all the principles of orthodoxy.

Q. On that ground, can 't you consent to the orthodoxy of the Christian Church—on the ground that it has some of the principles of orthodoxy? But what are the true sources of truth of which you speak?

A. In regard to the salvation of a man's soul?

Q. Of course.

A. God himself is the source of truth. He has given men His revelation of the truth in the Bible by his Holy Spirit and by his Son.

Q. That men may find out what truth is?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Did I understand you to say that the Bible is not sufficient to inform a common man what the truth is without extra help?

A. No, sir; I did not testify so, nor do I wish to be so understood.

Q. On the contrary, do you now say that the Bible is sufficient for the instruction of any man who seeks the true doctrine, or who will try to find out what the truth is?

A. I will answer that by saying, the Bible is the same to all mankind, it is the expression of the truth.

Q. But the question I asked you was this, and will you have the kindness to confine your answer to the question: Do you now say that the Bible is a sufficient aid to any man who has a desire to seek the truth, and that if he will read the Bible it will direct him in the right way?

A. Do you wish him to be his own guide first?

Q. I speak of the Bible truths as they are taught in the Bible. I meant to be understood as asking you if it is sufficient to direct him in the right way—the Bible itself.

A. The question is hardly susceptible of a correct and full answer—not by the answer of yes or no.

Q. Well, sir, answer it as you please, and then give the additional explanation.

A. I would say, yes, sir, it is; that is, the conditions are all sufficient for man's salvation. It is also true that the instruction in relation to the Bible—the instruction drawn from the Bible by persons commanded to inquire into and study the Bible, or rather to draw the correct faith from it and give it to the Christian that it may be expounded to mankind by preaching, and that we may be able to teach and influence mankind by the Word in the preaching of the gospel, and thus obey the commission given to the evangelists to preach the gospel, and by these labors to give to the church, to the sinner, and to the Christian the truth, that they may be controlled by the proper influence—it is true that all this teaching must be drawn from the Bible, that the Bible must be the source of instruction.

Q. Do you say that it is necessary to have the Bible interpreted?

A. Necessary to have it interpreted?

Q. Yes, sir.

A. Ordinarily, in order that all may concur in the truth, the instruction is furnished them.

Q. Mr. Smith, do you say that it is necessary to have instruction in the truths of the Bible when one has access to the Bible himself? On the contrary, is not the Bible so plain to the common understanding that, if a man will read it carefully, it will be to him a perfect guide into the right way?

A. I will deny that to be the case. A person may need instruction upon certain matters. For instance: when the Bible speaks of Philip and the Eunuch we are told that the Spirit commanded Philip to join the Eunuch as he was riding along in his chariot reading the Old Testament Scriptures, for it would be necessary that he should have some teaching upon the subject upon which he was reading. It was necessary that this inquirer be furnished with some means of understanding when he was reading the word of God; and so Philip was sent.

Q. But the Eunuch did not have access to all the Bible—the New Testament was not yet written. Philip only supplied the information which the New Testament will now do; he gave by inspiration on that occasion what the New Testament now supplies. Then the Scriptures were imperfect, for they were not complete; they are now complete, and, therefore, perfect, and if they are perfect they ought to be a perfect guide unto eternal life—ought they not?

A. It would be the same, any way.

Q. Mr. Smith, do you want this jury to understand you to say that a soul must be lost because it does not have a minister to interpret the Scriptures to it?

A. No, sir; that does not follow.

Q. Do you want to say that the Bible is not a sufficient guide for a person who is able to read and understand; that a responsible person can not find out the truth in that Bible without aid from other persons?

A. I would not say that a person will be lost because he is not supplied with a teacher in the Word of God. A person will not be lost for that reason; but he may have need of instruction in the essential principles of the gospel that, so far as faith is concerned, he may have faith in its statements and requirements. The province of a minister is to furnish men and members of the church the right doctrine. Now, that is the reason why it is necessary to have a teacher.

Q. There is no doubt that teachers are useful, but are they necessary with the Bible in one's own hand?

A. Through preaching any person who is deprived of the use of a book is enabled to become informed and acquainted with the questions which it discusses.

Q. Mr. Smith, will you give a more complete doctrine than that in the Bible

A. Did you ask me to announce a more complete doctrine?

Q. Yes, sir; is there a more complete doctrine than that which is found in the Bible?

A. No, sir.

Q. You believe that "All scripture is given by inspiration of God,

and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness; that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works"?

A. That is correct.

Q. That is good doctrine?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. You consider that good doctrine?

A. Yes, sir; that is correct and I believe it, it is in accordance with all the points I have stated.

Q. Well, do you mean to receive that as orthodox?

A. I believe that doctrine, I believe that——

Q. And you accept it?

A. I concur with that, and I think it is orthodox, of course.

Q. Mr. Smith, if the Bible is sufficient to enlighten a man as to salvation, and to enable him to find the way to eternal life and to keep him in it, what becomes of the necessity of believing that doctrine which you have testified to as necessary to orthodoxy, that of the miraculous impact of the personal Spirit upon the soul to change the nature of a man?

A. Sir?

Q. Now, Mr. Smith, you have given two points upon which you think the Christian Church is not orthodox. Will you now please state all of the points upon which you think this Church is not orthodox? But I will ask you if you think all the churches concur upon the doctrine of the Trinity as you have stated it?

A. So far as I know. I do not pretend to know only from what I have heard members of the different denominations say. There may be persons who are unsound upon this as well as upon other principles, or subjects, or belief; but I don't know, however.

Q. Mr. Smith, if a person be right so far as his doctrine is concerned in the main, do you make a test of the belief in the doctrine of the Trinity as you have expounded it? I desire you to state to the jury, in regard to keeping members in the Church, if one be right in other things, whether or not he is to be required to accept the principles of the doctrine of the Trinity as you have stated them.

A. I frequently do so, so far as I think it is necessary to ascertain one's belief upon it.

Q. Mr. Smith, you may now state what other doctrine or belief is held by the Christian Church, which you regard as not being orthodox—state it, if you please.

A. The belief which I understand them to hold in relation to the doctrine of human depravity is an additional one.

Q. What do you understand to be the teaching of the Christian Church upon that subject?

A. I understand the teaching of the Christian Church to be that the human race is not, in consequence of the sin of Adam, so bereft of righteousness and so debased in its moral condition but that men may renew their life without the supernatural agency in their conversion; that by the effect of the fall, through death and its circumstances and relations, Adam's condemnation in a certain sense has come upon the human race, and in consequence any one is liable to sin, but that this condemnation does not extend to the perversion of the moral nature nor that the corruption of the moral nature is derived hereditarily from the forefathers.

Q. Mr. Smith, do you understand the Christian Church to reject the fall of Adam and his condemnation?

A. No, sir; not in that sense.

Q. Do you understand that Church to teach any more than that by the sin of Adam the human race is condemned?

A. I understand that Church to teach that by Adam's sin men are condemned to death; but that does not cover the ground. It is to that part of the question to which I referred.

Q. Do you not understand the Christian Church to believe that it is through the atonement of Christ, and through the Word of God—through the teachings of the Holy Scriptures, and the influence of the Holy Spirit, men may be led to repentance and to become Christians?

A. I understand that it teaches that, in consequence of the atonement, a man may be reconciled and brought into relation with God; but that a person is not contaminated by hereditary sin, that he is not in a state of depravity, as I would regard it.

Q. That is your idea, is it: not that the Church does not believe that man is depraved in his nature, but that it rejects the supernatural agency?

A. No, sir; that is not the idea. It is this, that the supernatural agency is required for the depraved nature.

Q. What agency that is supernatural do orthodox denominations, so-called, believe in besides the agencies of the blood of Christ, and the influence of the Holy Spirit upon the heart in connection with the Word of God?

A. I think your statement does not permit of an explanation.

Q. Put it just as you understand it. Answer the question.

A. In what sense?

Q. It is certainly plain enough; you can consider the questions just as you understand them. Here is the question: "What agency that is supernatural do orthodox denominations, so-called, believe in besides the agencies of the blood of Christ, and the influence of the Holy Spirit upon the heart in connection with the Word of God?"

A. For one, the influence of the Holy Spirit, which I understand to be promised—that direct agency or energy that is brought to bear upon the soul: so the renewing influence is a condition of the atonement. I have already made an explanation of that statement. The whole Scriptures teach us that the stone that the builders rejected has come to be the chief corner.

Q. Then this direct impact supernatural agency upheaving and turning upside down the moral nature of man is the chief corner of orthodoxy, is it? When you speak of the supernatural agency, believed in by orthodox denominations, is it what I have just stated to you?

A. The only answer I would give upon the subject of divine agency is, that I regard it as being necessary to a recognized orthodox faith. However, I would make the explanation that it must be guarded against in explaining the influence—it might be explained to be something else.

Q. What do you understand to be that influence, Mr. Smith?

A. What do you say?

Q. What do you undarstand to be that influence?

A. I understand it to be that agency that operates upon the heart of a man in his conversion.

Q. Well, now, using it in that sense, what do you say to my question?

A. I would say that it is not sufficient.

Q. That is not answering my question. My question was: "What agency that is supernatural do orthodox denominations, so-called, believe in besides the agencies of the blood of Christ, and the influence of the Holy Spirit upon the heart in connection with the Word of God?"

A. I do not understand your question.

Q. What other supernatural agency do the orthodox denominations believe in, in the conversion of persons, other than those I have named?

A. Not any other.

Q. Now, we will take your definition—I have accepted your definition—is there any other?

A. I said, taking the correct view of that definition, it is sufficient. The Scriptures, and the orthodox teaching, assert that that influence is exerted in the salvation of a soul.

Q. Mr. Smith, I asked you what other influence there is; will you please state it?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Now, do you say that there is any other influence except the Word of God and the Holy Spirit?

A. No, sir; there is not any other influence.

Q. Now, take it as you say: you spoke about the supernatural agency?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. I want to know what other supernatural agency there is believed in.

A. There is not any other agency, except that of the Holy Spirit, in connection with the blood of the Saviour. My understanding is, that it is the agency of the Holy Spirit that was promised. The word "influence" might require a definition. Taking it alone, without its safeguards, the term "agency" might mean more than "influence." There are revealed energies or powers requiring it to mean more that the word "influence." Taking it from that standpoint, and in that sense, the word might mean, and be understood to mean more.

Q. Then you say the word is used differently than in its common sense, do you?

A. The word "influence" is not the word I would use.

Q. I put this question to you: Has any one ever heard the word influence used to mean something else?

A. That is only an exception—I have answered you that already. I do not regard the word "influence" as expressing the same as the term "divine energy;" and that is requisite.

Q. What word will express it, Mr. Smith?

A. What word instead of the word influence?

Q. Yes, sir.

A. Well, some such term as "renewing energy."

Q. Renewing energy. Well, then, putting it in that way, what supernatural agency is there that orthodox denominations believe in other than the atoning efficacy of the blood of Christ, the "renewing energy" of the Holy Spirit, and the Word of God?

A. I think that that is what is promised. The atonement of the blood of Christ to save men, or procure their salvation. It affects men's relation, regenerates the soul, and changes the spiritual condition. It thus procures pardon, because the blood of Christ cleanses from all sin. It is——

Q. What has that to do with the supernatural agency? I am trying to find out that.

A. The supernatural agency, or the renewing energy, of the Holy Spirit?

Q. If a man believe in that, is he orthodox?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Yes, sir. Now do you say that the Christian Church does not believe in the renewing agency of the Holy Spirit?

A. I do not understand the teaching of that Church to mean that the soul is renewed.

Q. Do you know whether it does or does not, as a Church?

A. If it does, a different term is used in teaching it than the word I have used.

Q. Do you know anything about the doctrines of the Church as taught out there at Salem on the Haw-Patch?

A. Only just so far as I have investigated its faith and doctrines. I understand it to be taught by its preachers that the word "conversion" does not mean the exercise of the renewing energy of the Holy Spirit upon the soul; that it is only the operation of the revelation which God has given, and not the exercise of the renewing energy of the Spirit.

Q. Now, you say that the members of the Christian Church do not believe in the doctrine of human depravity, do you?

A. Sir?

Q. Do you say that they do not believe in the doctrine of human depravity?

A. I understand the members of that Church to deny the doctrine of human depravity, in the sense in which I have defined it—in the sense in which men are involved in the extraordinary circumstances and relations of the fall. What I understand to be orthodox teaching in regard to human depravity is this: That the corrupt and perverted condition of the moral faculties of the soul comes through hereditary transmission from the fall of the race, through parent to child, the same as the other qualities of our parents are transmitted; and that it is this hereditary perversion and corruption of the moral nature that requires the renewing energy of the Holy Ghost.

Q. If perversion and corruption of the moral nature is transmitted by hereditary descent, and if it require the renewing energy of the Holy Ghost to transform this hereditary corruption and perverted moral nature—if no power short of the supernatural, miraculous power of the Holy Ghost can do this—why did not the Holy Ghost lay right hold of Adam and change his moral nature, so that all his descendants might have had transmitted hereditarily to them, instead of a perverted and corrupt one, a pure and correct moral nature? The work would have been a much smaller one, and would have been just as effectual as the one which the Spirit now has on his hands, according to your statement of orthodox doctrine upon this point.

A. Sir?

Q. What other doctrine, held by the Christian Church, can you designate that is not orthodox?

A. What other doctrine?

Q. Yes, sir.

A. Another doctrine is this: It is taught, as I have been led to understand it, that regeneration and baptism by immersion are one and the same thing, being so intimately related that they can not be separated one from the other—that baptism by immersion is regeneration.

Q. Mr. Smith, do you understand that this Church holds a person can not be saved without baptism by immersion?

A. I understand that Church to hold, and I would direct my remarks to this one point, that being born again is to be baptized by immersion, and that this does not apply to a person in any other sense.

Q. Mr. Smith, is it not true that the Methodist Church, and the Lutheran Church, and the other churches, hold, as a part of their doctrine, that baptism is one of the commandments to be obeyed?

A. Certainly, baptism is a commandment.

Q. I will ask you if any of these will admit a person into their churches without baptism?

A. I did not hear every word distinctly.

Q. I asked you if the Methodist Church, or any of the churches—the so-called orthodox denominations—will admit persons to become members without baptism?

A. That is one of the conditions of membership. I understand the Methodist Churches do; and especially the Methodist Episcopal Church—I can speak particularly for it—requires baptism as one of the conditions of admission to its membership.

Q. I will ask you, Mr. Smith, if orthodox denominations do not teach that baptism is necessary to salvation?

A. In what sense?

Q. Mr. Smith, there can be no different senses. Now, then, I will repeat the question: Do they not teach that baptism is necessary to salvation?

A. If I must say yes or no, I say no.

Q. I will ask you, sir, if that is not one of the doctrines of the Lutheran Church? Here are the words: "My church teaches that baptism is necessary to salvation."

A. What authority have you there?

Q. To the Lutheran Church, sir; what do you say?

A. What do you ask in regard to that?

Q. I ask you if the Lutheran Church does not teach that doctrine in this very language: "My church teaches that baptism is necessary to salvation"?

A. I have never had any occasion to refer to the articles of the Lutheran Church upon that subject, so I am unable to speak upon that unless you will permit me to state what the ministers say in regard to it—I can speak understandingly with regard to the ministers of the Lutheran Church.

Q. I will ask you, sir, if the Presbyterian Church does not hold that baptism is a commandment of the New Testament, ordained originally by the Lord Jesus Christ in the commission?

A. I say that the sinful soul is given redemption and remission of sins through the Lord Jesus Christ. It is the command of Christ to be baptized for the remission of sins as promised in His truth—in His Word.

Q. So, then, that doctrine is taught?

A. Yes, sir; I so understand it.

Q. Then, is that orthodox doctrine?

A. I have never heard of a person putting the test of orthodoxy upon that subject.

Q. I will ask you if your own Church does not teach that doctrine? Does not your own Church teach that "except a man be born of water, and of the Spirit, he can not enter into the kingdom of God"?

A. We teach that, word for word.

Q. Yes, sir?

A. That is Scripture, and it is accepted, of course, by the Methodist Church. We do not accept every possible interpretation that might be given it—not every interpretation that might be put upon the words.

Q. Mr. Smith, if a person were to apply to your Church for membership, and he would refuse to be baptized, would he be received into the Church?

A. No, sir.

Q. Do you understand the Christian Church to claim anything more in its teaching upon this subject than "he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, but he that disbelieveth shall be condemned"? Do you understand the Church to teach anything more than that?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Well, what is it?

A. That baptism carries with it a saving efficacy.

Q. That what?

A. That it has a saving efficacy,

Q. What is that?

A. That baptism carries with it a saving efficacy—that there is a saving efficacy in baptism.

Q. What representative men of the Christian Church ever taught that?

A. All that I have ever heard preach upon the subject of baptism, without any exception, have conveyed that idea to me upon the question.

Q. Do n't you know that Mr. Campbell did not teach that doctrine?

A. No, sir; I do not know that.

Q. Do n't you know that Mr. Campbell, in his debate with Mr. Rice, said: "You have heard me say here (and the whole country may have read it and heard it many a time), that a seven-fold immersion in the river Jordan, or any other water, *without a previous change of heart, will avail nothing*, without a genuine faith and penitence. Nor would most strict

conformity to all the forms and usages of the most perfect church order; the most exact observance of all the ordinances, without personal faith, piety, and moral righteousness—without a new heart, hallowed lips, and a holy life, profit any man in reference to eternal salvation." (*Campbell and Rice, p. 678.*) Again: "While we regard immersion, or Christian baptism, as a wise, benevolent, and useful institution, we neither disparage, nor underrate, a new heart, repentance, or faith; nay, we teach with great clearness and definiteness, that, unpreceded by faith and repentance, it is of no value whatsoever. These two constitute a change of heart, a mental conversion; for all believing penitents have a new heart, and are prepared for being born into the kingdom of God." (*Campbell and Rice, p. 555.*) Again, Mr. Campbell says: "The outward act, then, is but the symbol of the transition, *inward and spiritual*, by which our souls are bathed in that ocean of love, which purifies our persons, and makes them one with the Lord. Without this, being born of water, or being connected with a church, is nothing—worse than nothing. Hence, without previous knowledge, faith, and repentance, immersion into the name, etc., is a mere outward and unprofitable ceremony. Hence my opposition to infant baptism; and hence my opposition to adult baptism, without a previous knowledge of the gospel." (*Campbell and Rice, p. 493.*)

A. If I understand his teaching, men come to the requisite requirements of the atonement by baptism. Those statements do not conflict—if I understand those statements, they do not conflict with the statement I have made.

Q. Did n't Mr. Campbell, as quoted from page 555 above, teach *that baptism is of no value whatsoever when unpreceded by faith and repentance?*

A. I do not call in question that he used that language.

Q. Mr. Smith, is it possible to put a plain proposition in language so as to have it imply an obscure meaning, so that some other meaning must be attached to it than what a man says?

A. I think it is complex in its terms. Rhetorically, it may be made to have a different explanation.

Q. You seem to have been studying to give Mr. Campbell's plainest statements rhetorical explanations. Do you see anything "complex" in that statement?

A. The teaching upon that subject is different from other authors.

Q. Mr. Smith, how is it about this: "By baptism, we who were 'by nature children of wrath,' are made the children of God. And this regeneration which our Church in so many places ascribes to baptism is more than barely being admitted into the Church, though commonly connected therewith; being 'grafted into the body of Christ's Church, we are made the children of God by adoption and grace.' This is grounded on the

plain words of our Lord, 'Except a man be born again of water and of the Spirit, he can not enter into the kingdom of God.' (John iii. 5.) By water, then, as a means, the water of baptism, we are regenerated or born again; whence it is also called by the Apostle, 'the washing of regeneration.' Our Church, therefore, ascribes no greater virtue to baptism than Christ himself has done. Nor does she ascribe it to the outward washing, but to the inward grace, which, added thereto, makes it a sacrament." (*Wesley's Doctrinal Tracts, pp. 248–9.*) What do you say to that?

A. Will you read the last clause again?

Q. "Nor does she ascribe it to outward washing, but to the inward grace, which, added thereto, makes it a sacrament."

A. I would like to hear you read sentence or two back of that: I did not get to hear it all.

Q. Yes, sir; I will read it again "By baptism, we who were 'by nature children of wrath,' are made the children of God. And this regeneration which our Church in so many places ascribes to baptism is more than barely being admitted into the Church, though commonly connected therewith; being 'grafted into the body of Christ's Church, we are made the children of God by adoption and grace.' This is grounded on the plain words of our Lord, 'Except a man be born again of water and of the Spirit, he can not enter into the kingdom of God.' (John iii. 5.) By water, then, as a means, the water of baptism, we are regenerated or born again; whence it is called by the Apostle, 'the washing of regeneration.' Our Church, therefore, ascribes no greater virtue to baptism than Christ himself has done. Nor does she ascribe it to the outward washing, but to the inward grace, which, added thereto, makes it a sacrament." What do you say to that?

A. What is the question?

Q. I want to know whether there is any "complexity" in that doctrine?

A. I think that there is an incorrectness in the formulation of the statement.

Q. You think the formulation is incorrect?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Well, what about this: "By baptism we are admitted into the Church, and consequently made members of Christ, its head. The Jews were admitted into the Church by circumcision, so are the Christians by baptism"? (*Wesley's Doctrinal Tracts, p. 248.*) How is that?

A. That is unsound.

Q. Then of this: "What are the benefits we receive by baptism? is the next point to be considered. And the first of these is, the washing away the guilt of original sin, by the application of the merits of Christ's death"? (*Wesley's Doctrinal Tracts, p. 246.*)

A. That is incorrect and unsound.

Q. Well, [the counsel lightly throwing the book down in front of the opposing counsel] that is Mr. John Wesley in his *Doctrinal Tracts.*

A. Taken alone, out of their connection, and without a further explanation, they do not express Mr. Wesley's own idea.

Q. (By Mr. Owen, one of the counsel for the plaintiff.) John Wesley's *Doctrinal Tracts* were published by the official action of the Methodist Church. Is n't that true, Mr. Smith?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Are the teachings set forth in Wesley's *Doctrinal Tracts*, published by the authority of the Methodist Church, a true statement of the Methodist doctrine of baptism? Or have you read them, and are you informed? Do you think those statements are right, or are they incorrect statements?

A. Taken abstractly, there are statements that would not be correct; but, taking Mr. Wesley's teachings as a whole, they show how he called baptism the washing away of the original sin.

Q. Yes, sir?

A. That is not the true Wesleyan doctrine, such as a minister would want to accept; that would not express the doctrine of the Methodist Church, when the statements are not taken in their connection.

Q. "And the virtue of this free gift, the merits of Christ's life and death are applied to us in baptism. 'He gave himself for the Church, that he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the Word,' (Eph. v. 25, 26); namely, in baptism, the ordinary instrument of our justification. Agreeably to this, our Church prays in the baptismal office, that the person to be baptized may be 'washed and sanctified by the Holy Ghost, and, being delivered from God's wrath, receive remission of sins, and enjoy the everlasting benediction of the heavenly washing.'" (*Wesley's Doctrinal Tracts, p. 247.*) Do you think that that is not a fair statement of the doctrine?

A. If it were to be taken without a just explanation, it would be liable to be understood in more senses than one; but, if it be understood in connection with the whole teaching throughout and the proper explanation, it is correct. It might be confounded, in many instances, with this heavenly washing. This heavenly washing is the true spiritual regeneration of the Holy Spirit in removing the contaminations of the soul; and the water, as I understand it, metaphorically speaking, is the heavenly or divine application.

Q. It is? Does not the Methodist Church teach, and did not Wesley do so too, that baptism is the washing of regeneration; that by it those who are "by nature children of wrath" are made the children of God; that to it is ascribed more than barely being admitted into the Church;

that "except a man be born of the water, and of the Spirit, he can not enter into the kingdom of God"—is not that the doctrine of your Church?

A. Yes, sir; that expresses the doctrine of our Church; yet it is liable, when taken without an explanation, to import something contrary to the sound meaning or understanding.

Q. Then, Mr. Smith, if a man subscribed to that doctrine throughout, he is orthodox in that respect, is he not?

A. If he subscribe to it in the sense accepted as the plain doctrine of the Church, he would be.

Q. Well, if you were to accept it in the plain meaning of the words—the plain ordinary meaning of the words—would you call him orthodox in that respect?

A. Well, yes; but I state this reservation: I can not accept all the interpretations that might be put upon those words. This washing of regeneration, as understood by the teachers of our Church, illustrates the operation or work of the Holy Spirit upon the soul. That baptism is the washing of regeneration is merely teaching metaphorically the application of the Holy Spirit—it is used metaphorically in that sense in the expression and in that connection. To say that the meaning of the application of the water is imitative, is incorrect and must be rejected.

Q. Mr. Smith, does not the Disciples' Church, in relation to this subject of baptism, adopt the scriptural teaching upon it?

A. I suppose they do, if they take nothing but the Scripture teaching upon it.

Q. I will ask you if it gives any other than the ordinary meaning to the words of the Scriptures in interpreting them?

A. Any other explanation? I would say so.

Q. Now, then, what do you say to this? "You may have heard me say here (and the whole country may have read it and heard it many a time), that a seven-fold immersion in the river Jordan, or any other water, *without a previous change of heart, will avail nothing*, without a genuine faith and repentance. Nor would the most strict conformity to all the forms and usages of the most perfect church order; the most exact observance of all the ordinances, without personal faith, piety, and moral righteousness—without a new heart, hallowed lips, and a holy life, profit any man in reference to eternal salvation.

"We are represented, because of the emphasis laid upon some ordinances, as though we made a savior of rites and ceremonies—as believing in water regeneration, and in the saving efficacy of immersion; and as looking no further than to these outward bodily acts; all of which is just as far from the truth and from our views, as transubstantiation and purgatory. I have, indeed, no faith in conversion by the Word without the

Spirit; nor by the Spirit without the Word. The Spirit is ever present with the Word, in conversion and in sanctification. A change of heart is essential to a change of character, and both are essential to admission into the kingdom of God. 'Without holiness no man shall enjoy God.' Though as scrupulous as a Pharisee, in tithing mint, anise, and cummin, and rigid to the letter in all observances, without those moral excellencies usually called righteousness and holiness, no man can be saved eternally; 'for the unrighteous shall not enter the kingdom of God.'" (*Campbell and Rice, p. 678.*) Now, Mr. Smith, is n't that just as genuine doctrine as the Methodist Church has ever given, either in its Discipline or in its other teachings—just as genuine in every respect?

A. That statement, without any other explanation, would not mean "the heavenly washing."

Q. Is n't that statement just as clear and just as orthodox doctrine as was ever expressed?

A. Yes, sir; in the main, it is orthodox.

Q. I repeat my question: Is not that statement as correct and as orthodox as any statement of doctrine that has ever been made?

A. Well, it does not express the full theory; and I would not call it fully orthodox, because it does not express "the heavenly washing."

Q. Just state where it is unorthodox?

A. You will find that the statement in reference to the operation of the Holy Spirit is unorthodox.

Q. Now sir, again: Does not that statement set forth just as clearly and just as well the truth as any of your teachings?

A. Yes, sir; that is, some of the sentences can be taken that way.

Q. Mr. Smith, I take it that a minister of the gospel would want to—would try to answer a matter correctly when he is called upon to give the truth.

A. Those statements, in some phases, are correct.

Q. Please answer the question.

A. But they are not correct in all their provisions.

Q. But I asked the question: Is not that statement just as plain and explicit a statement of the truth as your own Church gives in the Discipline, or in the *Doctrinal Tracts?*

A. I do not think it mentions everything—it recognizes a part of them. As a standard of faith concerning baptism and the relation of the sinner, I can not say so.

Q. But upon the subject of "the washing of regeneration," upon the subject of the efficacy of baptism, does it not express as explicitly the orthodox truth as your Church does in the *Doctrinal Tracts?*

A. As I have already said, so far as it goes, it is not objectionable.

Q. Mr. Smith, do you understand my question? I have been trying to put my questions in as plain language as possible. Do you not understand that I want to know about the statement as being explicit?

A. Do you mean to have me explain?

Q. No, sir; the question calls for an answer of yes or no.

A. Then I mean no.

Q. No?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Wherein are Wesley's *Doctrinal Tracts* a statement more explicit than the one I have read?

A. I have not been reviewing them recently.

Q. Then you do not know?

A. I say, so far as the *Doctrinal Tracts* are concerned, I know what they teach upon baptism—that is, so far as they teach baptism theologically; and Mr. Campbell is not as full and explicit as they are.

Q. Mr. Smith, do you remember any passage in Mr. Wesley's *Doctrinal Tracts*, upon the subject of baptism, that is more explicit than the statement I have read from Mr. Campbell?

A. I can not refer to the *Doctrinal Tracts.*

Q. Mr. Smith, will you answer the question?

A. I say, I can not refer to any particular passage.

Q. (By the Court.) He asks you whether or not you can remember any such statement.

Q. (By the counsel again.) Do you remember where there is any more explicit statement than the one I have read?

A. Yes, sir; I say I do.

Q. Whereabouts?

A. That is what I said, I can not refer to it. I have not reviewed the *Tracts* recently, and I am not prepared to speak upon the subject.

Q. That will do for that. Mr. Smith, going back, did I understand you to say that all orthodox denominations require baptism as being necessary for admission into their churches?

A. Whether I understand that all orthodox churches do what?

Q. Require baptism as a prerequisite for admission into the church in full membership?

A. I believe that some of the churches, recognized as orthodox in most points, do not regard baptism as requisite.

Q. What churches?

A. Some churches. The Quakers are orthodox in most respects. Pertaining to baptism, they understand that water baptism is not necessary; they reject it as being non-essential. Those people are orthodox.

Q. Then there are orthodox people who reject baptism?

A. Yes, sir; in that particular sense it is not required by orthodox churches.

Q. Well, then, do they reject it as being non-essential?

A. No, sir; I do not say that they reject it as being non-essential.

Q. Now, then, I will ask you: Don't orthodox churches, of course with the exception of the Quakers, require baptism as being essential to the admission of a member into the church?

A. That other churches except the Quakers do?

Q. Yes, sir.

A. Except the Quakers do?

Q. Yes, sir.

A. I think that is the case.

Q. Then, for the reason that the other churches require baptism for admission into the church, the Quakers are not orthodox in that respect?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Now, so far as the Christian Church acknowledges and requires faith in Christ as the Son of God—faith in the Lord Jesus Christ as the Son of God, who is the Saviour of the world, who died to save sinners by atoning for their sins with his own precious blood, and who offers salvation to all—it is orthodox, is it not?

A. Yes, sir; in those particulars.

Q. If it require true and genuine repentance of the sinner as necessary to admission into the Church, it is orthodox in that respect?

A. Repeat the question.

Q. If it require true and genuine faith and repentance of the sinner as requisite for an admission into the Church, it is orthodox in that respect, is it not?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. If it requires confession of sins, repentance, and a profession of faith in Christ, it is orthodox in those respects, is it not?

A. Yes, sir; that is correct in those particulars.

Q. Now, Mr. Smith, to get all of it, what other duty or point is there in which you think the Christian Church is not orthodox, other than what you have already mentioned?

A. I wish to say in regard to the points you have now before you, these statements I have admitted as being orthodox in so far as they go, that I do not make my admission as implying that there is to be any undue or mysterious teaching as to the efficacy of the same.

Q. I think we understand you. Now, Mr. Smith, what other point is there upon which you claim the Christian Church is not orthodox?

A. There are the——those are the cardinal points which I have stated.

Q. They are?

A. The cardinal doctrines which I have stated before I might have particularized more distinctly, perhaps; but I do not care to mention only just what is called for in the particular questions.

Q. Well, Mr. Smith, in your examination in chief, you stated that you did not regard the Christian Church as being orthodox. Now I want you to state to the jury all the points that it holds which you regard as not orthodox—give them in recapitulation.

A. I do not care to recapitulate the statements.

Q. Why do you refuse to restate the points in which you have testified that the Christian Church is not orthodox?

A. Because it would take too much time; but I can give them if you desire me to give the summary.

Q. Is there any other cardinal feature——

A. Sir?

Q. Are there any other cardinal features in which you regard that Church as not being orthodox?

A. There are none except those I have specified as being cardinal or leading points. There are others that I might have specified, but I did not think it was needed.

Q. Then Mr. Smith, I understand you, in speaking of orthodoxy, that there are certain cardinal points that a man must believe when he comes into the Church, and that there are other points in which persons may have differences of opinion and still they may all be orthodox. To illustrate: In relation to baptism, if one believe that immersion is the only true mode of performing it, you would not regard that as sufficient to put him out of the pale of orthodoxy, would you—simply as regards his belief as to the mode of baptism?

A. I do not think he would be orthodox in that respect; that is, in respect of his claim that immersion is the only mode of baptism.

Q. Yes, sir?

A. I think that that is not orthodox.

Q. I now ask you whether or not you would regard a church which held that doctrine as being an orthodox church?

A. I would not, in that particular.

Q. Then the whole Baptist Church will have to go out—it is not orthodox.

A. I think it will, on that particular point.

Q. I will ask you, Mr. Smith, if it is not a fact that all of the churches, and all of the professing Christians, all over the United States, believe that immersion is a proper method of baptism?

A. If that be true, I do not think it would affect my view of orthodoxy, or of orthodox faith.

Q. Mr. Smith, suppose that a member of your own Church should insist that immersion is the only proper mode of baptism, would you regard him as orthodox?

A. No, sir.

Q. Would you turn him out of the Church for that?

A. I do not think I would insist on proceedings for that particular reason, but I would not regard him as being orthodox on that point—I mean I would not sever his connection with the Church, but I would not regard him as orthodox.

Q. Mr. Smith, is there any other orthodox church in your view, other than the Methodist Episcopal Church?

A. There are other churches which are orthodox. A number of other churches, in the main points of faith which are necessary to salvation—when we come to what constitutes orthodoxy in its main points of belief, are orthodox. Of course we would not be allowed to give our opinion in the case.

Q. I will ask you again: Is there any other church, in your opinion, but the Methodist Episcopal Church, that is fully orthodox?

A. In the sense in which I use the word orthodoxy, in its general sense—using it in that sense, why there are other churches that are orthodox.

Q. What of the so-called Baptist Church? Is that orthodox, in your view?

A. In regard to those things essential to salvation, it is regarded as orthodox on those subjects.

Q. Well, then, Mr. Smith, the view we are coming to is this: What is genuine orthodoxy? To reach that point, I will ask you, sir, is a church which professes the following doctrine orthodox?

"III. By the decree of God, for the manifestation of His glory, some men and angels are predestinated unto everlasting life, and others foreordained to everlasting death.

"IV. These angels and men, thus predestinated and foreordained, are particularly and unchangeably designed; and their number is so certain and definite that it can not be either increased or diminished.

"V. Those of mankind that are predestinated unto life, God, before the foundation of the world was laid, according to His eternal and immutable purpose, and the secret counsel and good pleasure of his will, hath chosen in Christ, unto everlasting glory, out of His mere free grace and love, without foresight of faith or good works, or perseverence in either of them, or any other thing in the creature, as conditions, or causes moving thereunto; and all to the praise of His glorious grace." (*Westminster Confession of Faith, pp. 27-8.*) Now, I ask you whether or not you indorse that doctrine as orthodox?

A. No, sir; I don't accept that as correct doctrine, except there be qualifications. It might be accepted with certain conditions—if certain provisions and explanations were made. If it were explained to mean that all who submit to the terms of the gospel—in that sense it is orthodox; but taken in the sense which its words seem to import, without any additional explanation or comment, of course it could not be accepted—that is what I said some time ago.

Q. "Those of mankind that are predestinated unto life, God, before the foundation of the world was laid, according to his eternal and immutable purpose, and the secret counsel and good pleasure of his will, hath chosen in Christ, unto everlasting glory, out of his mere free grace and love, without foresight of faith or good works, or perseverance in either of them, or any other thing in the creature, as conditions, or causes moving thereunto; and all to the praise of his glorious grace." Now, do you say that that doctrine is orthodox?

A. That language might be, in a qualified sense.

Q. Do you believe in it?

A. No, sir.

Q. Is it orthodox?

A. No, sir.

Q. Is n't it a terrible doctrine?

A. Without a certain explanation, it is.

Q. Well, is not that the doctrine of the Presbyterian Church?

A. The formulated statements of the Westminster Confession of Faith are received by it.

Q. Do n't you think they are believed by it?

A. I do not think they are believed by it in an unqualified sense.

Q. Do you think that the Presbyterian Church does not believe every word of it—every word of it? Now, Mr. Smith, what would you say of a man who would come before a congregation and publicly make that statement of doctrine, word for word, and then would not insist that it meant just what the words plainly import upon their face?

(To this question objection was made and sustained.)

Q. Now, then, Mr. Smith, let me read again:

"VII. The rest of mankind, God was pleased, according to the unsearchable counsel of his own will, whereby he extendeth or withholdeth mercy as he pleaseth, for the glory of his sovereign power over his creatures, to pass by, and to ordain them to dishonor and wrath for their sin, to the praise of his glorious justice." (*Westminster Confession of Faith, p. 30.*) Do you say that that is orthodox doctrine?

A. Taking the formulated statement and the words alone, it would not be—it would not express what I might be led to conclude is correct; but

yet I might word that formulated statement so as to be received. Thus we find that with an explanation and in a modified sense we might accept the formulated statement and yet not understand it in the plain unqualified sense that the words would seem to imply.

Q. In other words, the Presbyterian Church does not understand it as you do?

A. The Presbyterians do not understand the words as I do?

Q. Yes, sir.

A. They do not understand the Confession of Faith to teach or mean what I understand the words unqualified to express.

Q. Mr. Smith, don't you understand this to be the correct and accepted doctrine of the Presbyterian Church: That some men are foreordained to everlasting life, and that the rest of men are foreordained to eternal damnation, and that those who are foreordained to eternal damnation can not be saved? Is not that the doctrine of the Presbyterian Church?

A. The doctrine of the Presbyterian Church, as I understand it——

Q. (By the Court.) Answer the question: yes, sir, or no, sir.

A. Well, make the statement again, if you please.

Q. I asked you, sir, if you do not think that this is the doctrine of the Presbyterian Church. Some men are foreordained to be saved and that they are called or elected to eternal happiness, and can not help being saved; and that the others are foreordained to eternal damnation, and can't be saved—can't help being damned? Do you not understand that to be the doctrine of the Presbyterian Church, as held and maintained by it at this time?

A. You want me to answer the question: yes, sir; or no, sir?

Q. Yes, sir.

A. Then, under that demand, I say: no, sir.

Q. You do not understand it to hold and maintain that doctrine?

A. No, sir.

Q. Well, what is the qualification you would make?

A. The qualification I would make is this: The Presbyterian Church received that formulated doctrine from times that are past, and there has been no change in the phraseology then used in the statement of the doctrine, so that the members and teachers do enjoin that theologically; but it would seem that there ought to be a change, for perhaps a majority of the teachers and influential members of the Church* do not believe that

---

* Upon this point, I insert the following correspondence as a foot-note By way of explanation, I may say that I am very much interested in what seems to be the changing aspect of religious sentiment in the world, and seeking to catch, if possible, its positive and certain drift. In my efforts to inform myself from the best sources

doctrine in the unqualified sense or accept what those words would seem to imply; but they entertain more liberal views of the plan of salvation. This is what I understand the present faith of that Church to be, and is what I mean.

Q. Do the Presbyterians, as a class, ignore this question?

A. Yes, sir; I think they do.

Q. Then their faith has changed?

A. I think it has become modified.

Q. You think it has become more orthodox?

A. It is more liberal.

Q. More orthodox?

A. Very well, I do not understand it exactly in that way.

Q. Do you regard that (that is, the belief or disbelief of this doctrine) the test of orthodoxy?

A. I do not regard any body that believes that doctrine unqualified as orthodox.

Q. Very well; you call it the test of orthodoxy?

A. Yes, sir.

---

upon this question, and with no thought that it would have any bearing upon the above witness's testimony, I wrote to Dr. William H. Green, of Princeton Theological Seminary, Princeton, New Jersey. Following is the correspondence:

"LIGONIER, IND., October 26, 1883.

"*Dear Sir:*—I am a constant reader of the *Herald and Presbyter*. I am very much interested in the changes which seem to be taking place in the religious world, that I may get their certain and positive drift, if I can. I observe from the *Herald and Presbyter* that there is springing up in your Church a desire to change your standards, how extensive this desire is I do not know. And further If I am not mistaken, there has been a change in the interpretation of the *Confession of Faith* by its adherents from what it was fifty or one hundred years ago Being interested in these changes which are going on in Christendom as a historical and psychological study, and not wishing to attribute to your people any interpretation of their standards which they themselves would repudiate, I apply to you for information upon the following point: What is the present conception of the Presbyterian Church as to the doctrine taught in Sections III. and IV., Chapter III., of the *Confession of Faith*, and referred to in Questions 12 and 13 of the *Larger Catechism*, and in Question 7 of the *Shorter Catechism*—what is the present teaching of the Presbyterian Church in relation to the decrees, the foreordination and predestination of God?

"Very kindly yours, J. H EDWARDS."

To this letter D A. A. Hodge wrote the following reply:

"PRINCETON, N J. November 1, 1883.

"REV. J. H. EDWARDS—*Sir:*—Dr. William H Green, the senior professor in Princeton Theological Seminary, handed your letter to me as the Professor of Systematic Theology

"I can answer your inquiries in one word. As far as known to us, professors of

Q. And the man who believes it, you would regard as being unorthodox, at least in that respect?

A. If he believes it in the modified sense and not in the absolute unqualified sense, I think, so far as that one point is concerned, he would be received as orthodox; that is, so far as he might accept it in that modified sense.

Q. Take the witness.

Re-Examination by the Counsel for the Defendant.

Q. Mr. Witness, you may state what the truth is as to the fact that churches have certain doctrines that do not form or do not constitute the doctrines you call orthodox. What is the fact as to that? Tell us whether or not they have some doctrines that do not form a part, do not constitute the doctrines that you call orthodox.

A. That is a fact.

Q. Now, I ask if this doctrine of predestination is not one of the doctrines of the Presbyterian Church that is not accepted in its accustomed sense—whether or not that is one of the excluded doctrines?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Now, Mr. Witness, isn't it a fact that many of these religious formulas in the creeds—these statements of belief—are such as might be

---

Princeton Seminary, there is no desire to change the doctrinal standards of the Presbyterian Church. It may be honestly desired by a *few* men without organization or influence. It may be played with as a purely *theoretical* question by an inconsiderable faction in the newspapers But the question certainly is not entertained anywhere as a *practical* one, and if once introduced it would be immediately buried by an overwhelming majority of votes, and by an infinite preponderance of influence. There is no likelihood of its being agitated practically in the Presbyterian Church in the next two hundred years, any more than in the past two hundred

"The Confession of Faith and Catechisms are now interpreted, by the vast majority of the ministers of the Presbyterian Church, precisely in the sense the words naturally mean, precisely in the sense in which they have always been interpreted by intelligent and honest men from the beginning.

"Especially there is not the signs of any party in the Presbyterian Church which wishes to put any meaning upon the seventh question of the Shorter Catechism, or the twelfth and thirteenth questions of the Larger Catechism, different from the meaning, on the same subject, of John Calvin—different from what the words clearly mean, and have been always, by honest and sincere Calvinists, understood to mean.

"I hope I have made the matter clear. There is no doubt that I have stated the facts of the case truly. Yours very sincerely, A. A. HODGE."

"P. S.—To this answer to your questions every professor in this Seminary would heartily subscribe, and every friend, patron, and trustee of this Seminary, the oldest and largest in the denomination. A. A. H."

Thus the orthodoxy of the Presbyterian Church, on the testimony of the witness, must go.—EDITOR.

called superfluous, and do not form the rule, and are not necessary in any way—that they may be interpreted in one way or another?

A. That is true; that is very true.

Q. So, then, it does not follow that these churches are not orthodox because the statement in that respect might not be true?

A. It does not follow that they are not orthodox because the statement in that respect is not true.

Q. For instance: Some statements were read yesterday from the creed, from the so-called Methodist Creed. I will ask you if it is not a fact that the profession or belief in these may not be made in such a way—if one can not make a profession of faith in them in such a way—as to make him thoroughly heterodox?

A. That is true. That is what I have been endeavoring to make you understand in some of my answers.

Q. It was called out when they were reading to you in the shape of a question from the creed—from paragraph 6, I believe. This statement was called orthodox, and you were asked if it were orthodox. Now, I ask you, Mr. Witness, if a man may not profess to believe and accept the teaching, and at the same time put such an interpretation or construction upon it, as to be in truth wholly heterodox? What is the fact about that?

A. That is true. He might literally accept the rule, or form or make an expression of belief upon the rules. and really not accept the doctrine at all.

Q. I will ask you, Mr. Witness, if a man's belief or disbelief in any of the essential ecclesiastical writings, whether his acceptance on non-acceptance of them, affects his orthodoxy?

A. If I understand you, you ask me if that does or does not make the test?

Q. If it would be; yes, sir.

A. No, sir, not in the main; it would not be the test.

Q. State a better test of a man's profession or belief when he makes his statement as he understands it. For instance: The absolutely correct belief of a sermon. State it with your own interpretation upon it.

A. The only way would be an acceptation of his belief.

Q. For instance: If he accepted the Episcopal Creed, would that be a complete test of his orthodoxy?

A. It would not.

Q. You stated yesterday that the meaning of the word "orthodox" is right faith.

A. Right opinion.

Q. Right opinion?

A. Right opinion.

Q. Right opinion?

A. Yes, sir; right opinion.

Q. And there was something read from the Methodist Episcopal Creed. I ask you whether or not this is your answer—I have already asked you that question. Well, further along you were asked something about heterodox belief; and a part of Mr. Campbell's works was read, and something was said about the operation of the Holy Spirit; and you were asked what you believed with reference to these things. Now, I will ask you, if a man accepts a statement throughout as right in respect of the Holy Spirit, but puts a peculiar construction upon the words, may he not be heterodox, notwithstanding his statement of belief of it?

(To this question objection was made.)

Q. Now, you were asked yesterday, Mr. Witness, whether or not a man professing to believe in a certain statement of the operation of the Spirit was orthodox; and also whether or not you would accept that statement as it was, or whether it would mean more than the mere words. I will ask you whether or not any doctrine, the orthodoxy of which you were questioned about, as pertaining to the Christian Church—whether or not it may mean more than the mere words would indicate? You may state what the fact is.

(Objection was made to this question, but it was repeated.)

Q. Now, I ask you whether or not, when you were asked that, you meant that the statement may mean more than the words would seem to indicate?

A. I meant that we must conscientiously subscribe to it.

Q. (By the plaintiff.) Conscientiously?

A. That is what I said.

Q. I will now call your attention to a paragraph which was read yesterday: "Now, as Jesus, the Messiah, in the work of mediation, operates through his blood; so the Holy Spirit, in his official agency, operates through the Word and its ordinances. And thus we have arrived at the proper consideration of our proposition, to wit: In conversion and sanctification, the Holy Spirit operates only through the Word of Truth." (*Campbell and Rice, pp. 616–17.*) Is that orthodox, or otherwise?

A. I do not regard it as orthodox.

Q. Mr. Witness, you stated yesterday that the doctrine of the Campbellite Church—the Christian Church—differs from the doctrine of the orthodox churches in relation to the Trinity; and they read you a lot of statements, and then asked you if a man who believed them was not sound on the question of the Trinity. I will ask you if a man can not believe some of these statements as they were given and yet so interpret them as not to be orthodox?

(To this question objection was made.)

Q. Now, then, Mr. Witness, I will ask you whether or not, in reference to any one of those skeleton statements read—for instance, the one read to you yesterday touching the doctrine of the Trinity—if a man were to be found who believed them, that would make him orthodox? What is the fact in this relation?

(Objection was made to this question.)

Q. You may state whether or not such belief would prove him to be orthodox.

(Objection was still made to this question, but it was answered.)

A. I would answer in the negative. It does not follow that he is orthodox.

Q. Now, if the Court please, I want to call the attention of the witness to a few propositions here in *Campbell and Rice, p. 47.*

(The plaintiff objected to the defendant reading any passage that was not read on examination in chief or on cross-examination; but the objection was overruled, and the passages were allowed to be read as original questions.)

Q. Proposition First. "The immersion in water of a proper subject into the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, is the one, only apostolic or Christian baptism." Now, Mr. Witness, is that a statement of good doctrine?

A. It is not orthodox.

Q. Proposition Second. "The infant of a believing parent is a scriptural subject of baptism." Is that orthodox?

A. The denial of it is non-orthodox.

Q. Proposition Third: "Christian baptism is for the remission of past sins." Is that a declaration of orthodox doctrine?

A. It is not orthodox.

Q. Proposition Fourth: "Baptism is to be administered only by a bishop or ordained presbyter." What do you say as to the orthodoxy of that proposition?

A. That is orthodox.

Q. Proposition Fifth: "In conversion and sanctification, the Spirit of God operates on persons only through the Word of Truth." What do you say as to the orthodoxy of that?

A. That is not orthodox.

Q. Proposition Sixth: "Human creeds, as bonds of union and communion, are necessarily heretical and schismatical." What do you say concerning the orthodoxy of that?

A. It is not orthodox.

Q. I will now ask you, Mr. Witness, whether or not from your expe-

rience you recognize any of these propositions as being the doctrine of the Campbellite or Christian Church?

(To this question objection was made, but it was repeated.)

Q. Instance them, if you remember the propositions.

A. Some of them I recognize as the doctrines of the Christian or Campbellite Church. The first one I did not hear distinctly.

Q. Take the subject, then.

A. Yes, sir; the subject I can.

Q. For instance, that the method of baptism is by immersion, and so forth.

A. Yes, sir; I recognize that as being the doctrine of the so-called Christian or Campbellite Church.

Q. The second proposition, in reference to infant baptism?

A. That is not Mr. Campbell's doctrine.

Q. What is the fact in relation to Christian baptism being for the remission of past sins?

A. That I understand to be the doctrine of the Campbellite Church.

Q. (By the plaintiff.) Did I understand you to say that that is not orthodox?

A. That is not orthodox.

Q. Now, sir, how is it with the proposition that baptism should be administered only by the bishop or preacher?

A. I do not understand that to be the doctrine of the Campbellite Church.

Q. How is it about the Spirit, in conversion and sanctification, operating only through the truth?

A. I understand that to be the doctrine of the Campbellite Church.

Q. What do you say about the last one, that creeds are necessarily heretical and schismatical?

A. I understand that to be one of their doctrines—one of the doctrines of the Christian or Campbellite Church.

Reëxamination by the Plaintiff upon the New Subject Matter Introduced by the Defendant on the Reëxamination.

Q. Now, Mr. Smith, I understand you to say that Christian baptism for the remission of past sins is not orthodox?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. "Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins: and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." (Acts ii. 38.) Do you understand that not to refer to past sins?

A. Not in the same sense that I understand it to be promised in the Scriptures.

Q. You quote it in a different application? Do you mean to say that baptism is not for the remission of past sins in any of the shades of meaning of that phrase?

A. It looks like it was not given for that.

Q. Will you answer the question: Does that statement in any and all of its shades of meaning, as read, bear on its face that Christian baptism is for the remission of past sins? Is not that what the language plainly imports?

A. As——

Q. Please answer the question, Mr. Smith. You answered Mr. Glasgow very frequently that baptism for remission of sins is not orthodox. I desire that you answer my question, and I intend that you shall do it. I have asked you quite frequently whether or not you understand the expression "Christian baptism is for the remission of past sins" to be anything only what the plain ordinary language imports?

A. Not so far as the ordinance of baptism is concerned.

Q. Yes, sir. Now, then, when Peter says, "Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins; and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost," do you understand that Peter did not mean that baptism was for the remission of past sins? Now, please answer my question, yes or no.

A. I think that that was included in its relation to the results.

Q. Yes, sir; you do think that Peter meant and included past sins in his statement?

A. As a result.

Q. Mr. Witness, there is no use of equivocating around about the statement.

(The defendant objects to the manner of the examination.)

Q. I want a fair answer when I ask whether or not Peter did not mean and include the remission of sins—of past sins—as the purpose of baptism, and I mean to have it.

(Objection was made to this question, but it was repeated.)

Q. When Peter says, "Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins," do you not understand him to be referring to past sins?

A. I do not deny it.

Q. Will you answer my question? Do you understand him to be referring to past sins?

A. Yes, sir; he included them in his meaning.

Q. Then was Peter orthodox, or was he not orthodox?

(To this question objection was made.)

Q. Then, is that which I have read from the New Testament orthodox doctrine?

A. That which you read from the New Testament is orthodox, yet it is subject to interpretation that might not be.

Q. Whose interpretation—yours or mine; that which is the plain import of the words, or that which is not? Mr. Smith, if you understand that Peter meant, when he gave the command to be baptized to the Pentecostans, that baptism was to be for the remission of past sins, is it heterodoxy when the Christian Church affirms the proposition that baptism is for the remission of past sins?

A. Do you ask me that, that I may prove baptism is not for past sins?

Q. Yes, sir; if you can.

A. On what theory that doctrine is heterodox?

Q. Yes, sir.

A. "Baptized for the remission of sins" does not denote that it is by baptism, but indicates the relation which baptism sustains to us. When we come unto Christ, and are pardoned of past sins, it holds a specific place; for it is true that we must receive the ordinance of baptism in accordance with Christ's institution of it. It was instituted according to the divine faith which brought with it the remission of sins, and we meet this remission of sins, as the result of faith, in the act of baptism—a result of exercising it in this ordinance. While baptism is designated as a true ordinance, yet in its import it does not mean that it is for the remission of past sins. Now, if we were surrounded by the proper explanations I would say it was for the remission of sins; but by the divine command of Christ it is not truly specified that baptism, in its import, is for the remission of past sins, because it denotes the washing of regeneration which is accomplished by the Holy Spirit—that is, I would say if a soul were to come into the kingdom of God, that it is by the operation of the Holy Spirit that the soul is converted and sanctified, and then by this ordinance it comes into near relation with God.

Q. Now, Mr. Smith, when Peter demanded Christian baptism for the remission of past sins, was it right? Is that orthodox?

A. Yes, sir; it is orthodox so far as it goes and in its proper relation.

Q. When Peter says it, it is orthodox doctrine?

A. It is orthodox doctrine, if it is not misapplied.

Q. But when a member of the Christian Church states it, it is not orthodox—is that your proposition?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Will you please state how it was you answered the counsel when he read to you the proposition with reference to this from Mr. Campbell's debate—when he asked you if a church that believes that baptism is for the remission of past sins is orthodox?

A. I did not mean in its complete import.

Q. You meant that it is not orthodox in its complete import; that is, speaking of orthodox doctrine?

A. So far as that expression has any bearing, it does not import that.

Q. Mr. Witness, how does it come that you did not make that explanation when Mr. Glasgow asked you if baptism for the remission of past sins is orthodox, and you said it is not orthodox doctrine?

A. It is not orthodox.

Q. Just as it is. Mr. Witness, what is the use of saying that? I understand certain things. Just state in your own language, do you say that it is orthodox doctrine or not—that is, that Christian baptism is for the remission of past sins?

A. It is orthodox, so far as it goes.

Q. That is what I asked you: is Christian baptism for the remission of past sins? Do you now say that that is orthodox?

A. I have given what I understand to be the theory; and when you say that Christian baptism is for the remission of past sins, I can not accept that as orthodox.

Q. In the statement as I asked you, "Is Christian baptism for the remission of past sins?" do you say that is orthodox or not?

A. That Christian baptism is for remission of past sins?

Q. Yes, sir.

A. Now I want to know if you mean——

Q. Take it just as it is here.

Q. (By the Court.) Just as you would ordinarily understand the words in that connection.

A. Will you please ask the question again?

Q. This is the proposition, that Christian baptism is for the remission of past sins. Now, taking the language as the words would plainly import, is that orthodox doctrine or unorthodox doctrine?

A. It is not orthodox, taken absolutely away from the Scriptures.

Q. Then, sir, the doctrine of Peter, when he said, "Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins," is not orthodox, is it?

A. That is correct, because it is in its connection.

Q. Now, sir, I repeat, just state whether or not the proposition I read from Peter, that baptism in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ is for the remission of sins, imports past sins—but you have already stated that to the jury. Now, then, I will ask you if that proposition of Peter's is orthodox?

A. The proposition that Peter made is orthodox, because it stands in its connection.

Q. Well, sir, just take it as it is, standing alone, what do you say

about it? what do you say about it, taking that verse alone just as Peter said it?

A. I have never taken that portion alone.

Q. (By the Court.) He asks you to do that now, and give your opinion.

A. If you want me to give my opinion, I will say that Peter is correct.

Q. That is the question; taking that verse—the thirty-eighth verse of the second chapter of the Acts of the Apostles—whether that is an orthodox statement.

A. That Scriptural statement is an orthodox statement, of course.

Q. Mr. Smith——

A. Of course it must be taken in its common sense application—I refer to the purpose of baptism.

Q. Well, I mean to take it alone, without anything else.

A. I submit that that can not be done.

Q. (By the Court.) You are to take it alone, of course not considering that it is quoted to you; you are to take the literal meaning of it; you are to take it without anything else: you are to decide upon the matter, and then give your opinion.

Q. The purpose of my question is for you to pass your opinion upon it as you would upon any subject—that is what I mean.

A. The statement, as I have already stated before, is a correct statement.

Q. Do you mean that it is orthodox?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Then, in the proposition that Christian baptism is for the remission of past sins—I ask you if that is not orthodox doctrine?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Standing alone; that is, without anything else?

A. I could not understand its import as the teaching of the Bible when it is taken as an extract, and not in connection with the faith.

Q. Then, Mr. Witness, when Mr. Glasgow asked, why did you say, without any qualification, that it is not orthodox doctrine? why did n't you qualify it to the jury without being called upon?

A. Mr. Glasgow asked me——

(To this question objection was made.)

Q. Now, take Peter's statement again: "Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins." Does that mean to repent for the remission of sins, and then to be baptized for the remission of sins?

(To this question objection was made.)

Q. Mr. Witness, what do you say to the proposition, that Christian

baptism is for the remission of sins—do you say that it is unorthodox, standing alone and unconnected?

A. It is orthodox, as announced in the Bible.

Q. Is it orthodox, unqualified as it is there?

A. Yes, sir; it is as it is announced there.

Q. Well, Christian baptism is for the remission of sins—is that an orthodox statement?

A. As it is, the declaration does not embody faith, it does not refer to it; and it is faith that operates to purify the heart, and not baptism.

Q. (By the Court.) You are not to take it that way, but you are to give your opinion of it as it is without anything else.

A. That is, the Spirit operates with it and through faith—in that connection the theory is correct, but the promise independent is not orthodox.

Q. That is not the proposition. But take this: "And now, why tarriest thou? arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling upon the name of the Lord." (Acts xxii. 16.) What do you say about that?

A. As far as it is a Bible truth, it is correct.

Q. Well, is there any difference between saying, "Arise and be baptized and wash away thy sins," and the proposition, "Christian baptism is for the remission of sins"?

A. What is that question? I believe I passed upon that.

Q. Now, Mr. Witness, to the first proposition that "the immersion in water of a proper subject, into the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, is the one, only apostolic or Christian baptism." Now, I desire to know if you accept that as the proper baptism for the remission of sins—the immersion in water into the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit—whether or not you regard that as proper baptism?

A. Sir?

Q. With reference to baptism being by immersion in water, into the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit: do you say that that is not orthodox doctrine?

A. Not exclusively by immersion.

Q. Now, Mr. Witness, I will ask you if all the branches of the Baptist Church in the United States do not hold that baptism is to be by immersion?

A. I did not understand the statement.

Q. I asked you, sir, whether or not the whole Baptist denomination—all of them in this country and in England—does not hold that immersion in the water of the proper subject into the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, is the one and only baptism—Christian baptism?

A. I believe that is held in the Baptist Church.

Q. Now, do you say that the Baptist Church is not an orthodox denomination?

A. In some things it is right. To have one point wrong does not necessarily exclude the Church as heterodox. In regard to the general statement of faith, I should regard it as orthodox; but, in that one point, it is not right.

Q. Then, if the Christian Church has recognized immersion as the only baptism, if it be right in the cardinal points, it is orthodox; and you would not exclude it?

A. No, sir; if it were right on the points I have considered.

Q. Then, so far as the holding of the belief that immersion is the only Christian baptism is concerned, you would not make that the test whether or not a church be an orthodox one, would you?

A. In its general acceptation, I say I would not exclude a church so far as that part of the proposition is concerned.

Q. The proposition is this, Mr. Smith: You would not make that the test of a denomination's orthodoxy—that you would not make the belief that immersion is the only baptism the one and only test of orthodoxy; that you would not exclude a church as heterodox on that account. Would you want to make that the test?

A. Not the exclusive test.

Q. Then you would not say that, believing that immersion is the one and only Christian baptism, a denomination would thereby be made heterodox, would you?

A. I would take them to be heterodox in that particular.

Q. You understand my question—I know you do. You do not make that the exception? Where a denomination holds that belief you still regard them as orthodox?

A. It might be in general.

Q. It might be orthodox—do you say that to the jury?

A. It might be in general.

Q. Take this proposition: "The infant of a believing parent is a scriptural subject of baptism." I will ask you if the entire Baptist denomination does not reject that doctrine?

A. I understand they do, sir.

Q. Do you mean to hold that the acceptance of that doctrine is to be the test of orthodoxy, when you speak generally of the test of orthodoxy?

A. I submit that it signifies in regard to Christian teaching, so far as these things being a test is concerned, that in these things it is not sound—not correct in its manner of Christian teaching.

Q. Yes, sir; but take the general class of denominations that are considered orthodox, would they be excluded because they, for some reason, might reject that belief?

A. If they were orthodox in their belief, they would be recognized in the general sense of the word as orthodox; but as heterodox in that particular.

Q. The fourth proposition, that "baptism is to be administered only by a bishop or ordained presbyter"—that proposition you say is not orthodox?

A. No, sir; I consider that proposition as orthodox.

Q. You told me in your examination before that you regarded the Quakers as orthodox, did you not?

A. Not in every particular.

Q. Did I understand you to define the word "orthodox"? As I understand the meaning of the word, it signifies right opinion; but when you speak of it from one stand-point you say that no one is orthodox except persons who believe as you do. Please give me a more specific definition of the term. Do you say there are no persons, according to your opinion, who are fully orthodox in other denominations? Is that the way I understand you?

A. Yes, sir. I would not say that they are not right; but in order that they be orthodox, they must believe in the essential principles of salvation as I have given them. They must believe in the existence and being of God—they must believe in His person and existence.

Q. Now, to the other proposition: "In conversion and sanctification, the Spirit of God operates on persons only through the word of truth." You say that that is not orthodox?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Why not?

A. Because the Spirit of God operates on the human mind often independent of the word—in other words, in addition to the operation of the word. The word is the instrument, coupled with the operation of the Spirit—the Spirit can operate through the word, but it can operate without it, and independent of it.

Q. Mr. Smith, "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God." (John i. 1, 2.) Does the Spirit of God ever operate independent of that Word?

(To this question objection was made.)

Q. I will ask you, sir, if the Spirit of God does ever operate except through the Word—in conversion and sanctification does the Spirit operate on the person in any other way than through the Word?

A. Just repeat the question again.

Q. Does not the Spirit of God operate upon persons in conversion and sanctification through the Word?

A. The Spirit of God does often operate through the Word.

Q. Yes, sir.

A. But, as I explained before, it may operate independent of the Word.

Q. It depends upon what you mean. Do you mean that it operates independent of the Word as that term is used in the first chapter of John?

A. No, sir; I do not understand the term, as used in the gospel of St. John, to be synonymous with the gospel—"in the beginning was the Word," in that connection the term "Word" does not mean the gospel.

Q. But is not that Word understood to be the Son of God? and has not God spoken to men by his Son in the gospel? Now, if the Spirit does not operate independent of the Son who sent Him (the Spirit), how can it be said that the Spirit operates independent of His Word when He, Himself, is the Great Word who was in the beginning with God? Can it not as consistently be said that the Spirit of God operates independent of God? But to the remaining proposition: "Human creeds, as bonds of union and communion, are necessarily heretical and schismatical." You say that that is not orthodox doctrine. Now, if a man believe right, in regard to the essentials of Christianity as taught and included in the New Testament, would you say he is not orthodox because he does not believe in the human creed? If he truly believe the right doctrine, the divine revelation of the New Testament, independent of the human creed, do you say he is not orthodox?

A. It would be almost impossible to answer that question—it is a conundrum.

Q. The belief of the right doctrine, that is the test of orthodoxy is it not, Mr. Smith?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Well, the fundamental source of that doctrine is the Bible, is it not?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. Now, if he believe the Bible, he is orthodox, is he not?

A. Certainly.

Q. Then do you make the necessary acceptance of human creeds the test of orthodoxy, so-called orthodoxy? or do you make that test what he believes as taught in the Bible?

A. I understand the answer—the answer which I made touching that question is that what it imports—that proposition—is certainly heterodox.

I said that the affirmation is not orthodox, because there might be what are termed human creeds which are simply formulas of doctrines and duties drawn from the Bible, and which express the fundamental principles of faith and obedience as found in the Bible. To accept these is necessary; I regard it as necessary.

Q. What did you mean in your reëxamination when you said that a man who said that human creeds are not necessary, but are heretical and schismatical, is not orthodox? Do you say that, if the same doctrine be found in the Bible, it is not true doctrine? What do you say to it? Do you make orthodoxy turn upon the submission to human creeds, or upon a belief of the true doctrine as taught in the Bible?

A. The formulated test might be necessary, so far as belief in the Bible is concerned.

Q. Mr. Smith, did you not imply in what you said yesterday that the Episcopal Creed was the only test of orthodoxy?

A. I told you that it is, taken without explanation.

Q. Yes, sir; taken without explanation.

A. Without any explanation.

Q. Yes, sir. Now, then, what about this proposition which contends for nothing more than that human creeds, taken without any explanation, are necessarily heretical and schismatical?

A. It is not taking the human creeds, but that which they include. If a person believe that, it would be a sufficient acceptation of the right faith.

Q. Do you test any one's faith by his belief of the doctrines of the Bible? or if he reject all human creeds may he not still be orthodox? Because he does not believe the creeds, that does not necessarily make him heterodox, does it? Now, I will ask you if you take this view of the matter: Do you want to still hold to the proposition that a person who disbelieves in human creeds is not orthodox if, at the same time, he accept the doctrine of the New Testament?

A. I can only answer that question by saying that perhaps a person might believe in the Bible, and still by his formulated statement, drawn from the Bible, I could not regard his faith in the Bible as genuine.

Q. Then, Mr. Smith, taking that to be the case, there must be something more than the Bible for a man to believe, in order to be orthodox?

A. No, sir; I will explain that by saying, we must have statements of faith in almost the same expression to understand what is said about the Bible by others.

Q. That is, you say that human creeds are sufficient for his belief—is that it?

A. That very form necessarily contradicts the statement

Q. Then there must be something besides the Bible, and something besides the human creeds, in order to constitute orthodoxy?

A. No, sir; I do not think that, if you please.

Q. Then, you say the creed expresses it. Well, there is no other creed which the Protestant churches will adopt, except the Episcopal Creed, as the expression of belief?

A. The others are to be explained; and it depends upon the definition, the explanation, in order to agree.

Q. Mr. Smith, does the Methodist Episcopal Church adopt the Episcopal Creed?

A. Oh! certainly it does not adopt that creed in every exposition that may be given of it. It does not accept it in the light of the explanatory statements of its matter which may be made by other denominations. In some of the implications, for myself, I would want to know and understand all that it might mean in its qualifications. I do not know that I would care to know all the facts; I would take the truth in general, unless there were something that would seem to imply different.

Q. Mr. Smith, is not the proposition true as it has been stated, that human creeds are necessarily heretical and schismatical? Is not this proposition true, because you say that they require explanation; and do not these explanations necessarily generate schisms? Look at the Methodist Church: how many schisms have there been? If they are not necessarily schismatical, why do they have to be explained?

A. I do not so understand it.

Q. Mr. Smith, you heard this read yesterday, and I will repeat it: "In conversion and sanctification, the Spirit of God operates on persons only through the word of truth." Now I will ask you if you understand that the Holy Spirit operates only miraculously upon the heart?

A. The supernatural agency—I do not know, but I think it often works miraculously.

Q. Is there any other way that it operates, except through the word of truth and in this miraculous way of which you speak? If so, to what extent do you think it operates other than it is specified, other than it is affirmed and denied, in the proposition before us? After all, I will ask you, taking the whole statement, don't you think it is orthodox?

A. No, sir.

Q. Why not?

A. Because the Spirit of God operates upon us directly and upon the faculties of the soul merely miraculously.

Q. Mr. Smith, to what extent do you say the Spirit operates in other ways than is affirmed and denied in this proposition?

A. I do not understand these terms. I think they might have been more distinctly designated.

Q. Are not the terms perfectly simple, and can you make them mean anything else?

A. I do not understand that they are, when they are not taken in their connections.

INSTRUCTION BY THE COURT TO THE JURY.

Gentlemen of the Jury:—You will now be permitted to separate until one o'clock P. M. Remember the admonition given you not to talk about this case, nor to form or express any opinion. Court adjourns until one o'clock P. M.

THE CLOSING OF THE CASE.

JUNE 21, 1883, 1 o'clock P. M.

By the Sheriff: "Oh, yes; oh, yes; oh, yes; the Noble Circuit Court is now in session."

The defendants' attorneys now came into court and filed the following

REQUEST.

"The defendants ask that the Court require the jury to find a special verdict in this cause.

W. C. GLASGOW,
"J. H. BAKER,
"Defendants' Attorneys."

Whereupon, the attorneys explaining that they conceded the orthodoxy of the Christian Church, by order of the court, the jury was discharged; and upon the records of the Court the following finding of the Court upon this point was engrossed:

THE FINDING OF THE COURT.

"That said Christian Church denomination, and the ministers thereof, are orthodox; and that J. H. Edwards, one of the ministers of said Christian Church, was, at said last mentioned date (January, 1883), and still is ready and willing to hold religious services in said building for his denomination."

THE REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE.

State of Indiana, }
Noble County, } *ss.*

The State of Indiana, on relation of George K. Poyser and William A. King, plaintiff, *vs.* the Trustees of the Salem Church, etc.

I, George A. Yopst, do certify that I was appointed and sworn in said above entitled cause to take in short-hand a Verbatim Report of said case,

and that, pursuant to the order of the Court, I took a Verbatim Report of said case, and that the above and foregoing is a full, true, and complete transcript of the evidence relative to the orthodoxy of the Christian Church. GEORGE A. YOPST, Stenographer.

"AVISE LE FIN."

It has been said that, "when the mills of the gods grind, they grind slow but fine." May it not also truly be said that, "when the fire of God's word burns, it burns steady but hot"? If one does not want to be burned, he must keep out of the fire.

CHAPTER X.

ARGUMENT * BY W. D. OWEN, OF COUNSEL FOR THE PLAINTIFF.

GENTLEMEN:—You have committed to your trust a case of uncommon importance. Never before in the history of juries has a panel been called upon to decide the orthodoxy or heterodoxy of a religious body of people. That such a thing is possible under the eaves of the Twentieth Century, confirms it that something is strangely wrong in the religious world. I believe you are possessed of religious prejudices. Most men are. But when you ascended those steps into that box, you took your seats above bias, in the realm of exact justice, and you will a true verdict give, in the fear of God, and in the love of His truth, according to the testimony rendered.

A Methodist Protestant body, known as the Salem Church, in this county of Noble, and State of Indiana, and situated in the country, four miles from Ligonier, owned a church building that was rotting, and a membership that was dying. They resolved to build a new meeting-house. The membership, being unable for the task, asked assistance of the community. Friends proffered to assist, provided the house be made free to other religious people. Whereupon it was inserted in the subscription papers for the house, as follows, to-wit: "When the said house is not in use by the Methodist Protestant congregation in its regular worship, then the said house shall be open and free to the services of all other orthodox donominations." Three thousand dollars was raised thereon, fourteen hundred dollars of which came from persons not members of the Methodist Protestant Church. Of themselves they raised but one hundred dollars over half.

The evidence shows that, after the house was built, J. H. Edwards, of Ligonier, pastor of the Christian Church, preached in it once a month for nearly a year; he occupied it on Sunday afternoons, at three o'clock, a most difficult hour to obtain a hearing; and that he always had good attention and fine audiences. It has also been disclosed that the audiences of the Rev. Mr. Post, the Salem pastor, were neither good nor fine, and that for the past year they have been working on the problem of a further reduction.

---

* This argument was not delivered.

Last January the Trustees of Salem Chapel notified Mr. Edwards that he could not longer use "their" house, "except on funeral occasions." A member of the Protestant Church, and a gentleman not a member of any church, both, however, on the subscription paper, prayed the Court for a mandamus requiring the doors of Salem Chapel to be opened to J. H. Edwards and his congregation.

The Christian Church did not bring this action. Strangers brought it. We would not be known in this case, more than any other religious body, but the defense, in their answer to the complaint, charged that the Christian Church, the Church of Christ, of which J. H. Edwards is a member, was unorthodox in Christian religion, and preached and practiced things not lawful by the Word of God. Their answer makes the orthodoxy of the Christian Church the issue in action. This brings us to the lead in this trial, by casting the burden of proof on us. We are compelled to establish our orthodoxy. We take up the lead in this prosecution with considerable earnestness. We have much at stake. The verdict here rendered will not affect the Protestant Church to any great extent. They are a fragment that has flown off from the Methodist body in its natural revolutions. They have but seventy thousand members in the world, a less number than we have in this State of Indiana alone. They are reckoned as fractions in religious statistics. Under the present aggregating tendencies of religious bodies, they will be absorbed and taken finally out of existence by some larger party within a few years; which is as it should be, for they have never had the least excuse for an existence beyond their plea for lay representation. To us, however, your finding is a matter of large consequence. Our orthodoxy is on trial. Our seven hundred thousand members will go forth from this house "legally" orthodox, which will be a strength to the divine plea of the "Bible alone," so just in its character, and so valuable an ally in our mission that you will never be able to appreciate the good you have done for the story of the cross; or we shall go forth as heterodox, as unworthy of His high name whom we worship. The baneful shadow of such a verdict would not cease to the ends of the earth, and would hover about the doors of our houses of worship with awful significance.

As we assert the orthodoxy of the Christian Church, and the defense denies it, the burden of the proof rests with us. Where shall we find the true standard of church measurement? You are not to receive the testimony of Mr. Edwards as furnishing that standard. Highly as we may esteem him, his testimony must not be regarded as creating a standard for the church of the living God. We only ask that you accept his testimony as truly pointing out the faith and practice of the Christian Church. Likewise the utterances on the stand of Mr. Chapman, myself, and Mr. Carpenter, were

not made to erect an orthodox standard, but to establish clearly before your minds what this Church does hold and do. You are to take this solemnly proven position of the plaintiff's church, and place it alongside the infallible standard of Christianity, and see wherein it may vary, or if it fits into its exact measurement without the stroke of a hammer. Neither will you permit this standard to be erected by the testimony of the Rev. Dr. Smith, who is the acknowledged head of the eleven witnesses called for the defense. His testimony that we are unorthodox and heretical, was doubtless the earnest conviction of that venerable gentleman. But this jury, in its justice, will not tie us to the convictions of this witness. He charged many things against us as heretical which it was his "understanding" that we practiced. If you find anything he charged against us as "heretical and unsound" forming a part of our position, then take it and try it by the standard.

The utterances of our leading writers and speakers, here introduced, do not establish the standard of orthodoxy. They are only corroborative evidence on our faith and practice.

Where then shall we find the desired standard? Dr. Smith testified that the great doctrinal points of theology upon which the orthodox churches were agreed, formed the test. And he asserted that differing from them was heresy. These agreed points are the atonement, depravity, impact of the Spirit, and the Trinity. A few of the Protestant churches have made a corner on these elements in transcendental theology, and won't let any one into their orthodox pool unless accepting their statements of these four cardinal points. Scarcely any matter what else be preached, the acceptance of these establishes your orthodoxy. These fundamental points of Messrs. Smith and Post constitute the popular orthodox standard. They have sworn it. Also, these must be received in the formulated statements given by the schools. But these are not the standard. They are not the test of Christian fellowship and character. No man has ever been commanded by divine authority to believe in or to obey either of these formulated statements. To enforce them on the soul is impious towards the Head of the church, and subversive of the plan of Divine government. They are the doctrines of scholastic divinity, the vapory fulminations of brains pregnant with the philosophies of theology, but barren of the simple story of him whose life has filled the nations with light, and whose love is bringing a weeping world to his cross. The acceptance of these formulated statements can never bring a soul to the presence of its God, nor forgive a single sin. They may be the test of recognition among numerous religious bodies, but they can not decide the fitness of a church to wear the name of the risen Christ.

By what authority has any school, or church, or set of churches ever

set up a standard of orthodoxy? No competent authority has ever authorized it. It was a power unasked for in heaven, unassumed in hell, and only usurped among men when theologians were born. We repudiate these standards which the defense seeks to have accepted here. They are partial and sectarian. 'Tis ourselves who have affirmed our orthodoxy. Not against any other church, but before God. The word orthodoxy means the *true Christian faith.* We bring the book of the Christian faith and place it before you. You have heard our sworn witnesses on what we teach. Take our positions, measure them by the teachings in this Word of God. And if they they lie four-square by the line herein given by the Spirit, justify us by your verdict; if they do not, cast us forth, as also shall the judgment of God at the last day.

Hence in our evidence we have known no standard but the Word of God. We lift it above the heads of all the theologies, assert that it is divine, and challenge the defense to refuse it as the final chamber of appeal in this action. The defense must come to this standard; we can not go to theirs. Therefore have we introduced the Bible as the Christian's only standard of guidance. It says, "The entrance of thy Word giveth light." It says, "The gospel is the power of God unto salvation." That is all the power needed in the world. It says, "All scripture given by inspiration is profitable for reproof, for doctrine, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto every good work." By inspiration it pronounces itself able to accomplish that for which it was given to man. We have appealed to this infallible and divinely true standard.

The defense has followed us up here, and say they place the Bible in all their creeds as the only correct test, but that we do not make acceptable interpretations of the great cardinal doctrines. Our witnesses have repudiated these interpretations from every source whatsoever. To stand over a church, or in a court of justice, and proclaim one a heretic for refusing to accept certain statements of divinity is the worst of heresies. This scholastic theology has desolated the house of God for fifteen hundred years. The crime of the church has been that it has assumed to know more than Christ and him crucified. One may comprehend all these doctrines, and never know a sin forgiven; he may have mastered all the complicated formulas of systematic divinity, and never had his heart touched by the love of God. But if one accepts the gospel, he has been touched by the cross, he knows his sins forgiven, and has come to the salvation of God. If he be saved, Christ is for him, and who can be against him? The heretical maledictions of a doctor of divinity can not reach him there. If any man be in Christ Jesus, he is a new creature. His orthodoxy is established. What God has cleansed call not thou common or unclean.

The Word of God must decide all our controversies. The true Christian faith—real orthodoxy—is receiving the Bible alone, and obeying the commandments which take us from the world into Christ. Who have done this are orthodox. Who have not done so can not so claim. We claim to have done this.

Gentlemen, we accept the law's assertion that you are twelve men good and true, and with confidence we place this Word of God before you as "the divine path of salvation," of which path divinity has said, "It is so plain that the wayfaring man, though a fool, need not err therein." Our confidence in the integrity of God is such that we believe the path is just that plain. Although every one of you differ widely from us in your religious views, we believe you look down this book and see that path as it is. We have unrolled the history of our Church before you, and with an unfaltering trust in your uprightness we boldly, confidently commit to your decision whether we have ever, by faiths taught or practices obeyed, stepped beyond these ordinances of the King.

Orthodoxy does not mean the formulated doctrines of the schools. It does not mean a peculiar and technical phraseology concerning the cardinal points of direct impact, depravity, atonement, and the Trinity. We have ascertained that it means the true Christian faith. Putting it into practical operation it signifies the Bible, the whole Bible, and simply the Bible. Being permissible, under the evidence, let us go back to the original time and take some observations along the line of operation when this standard was set up and its great principles were for the first time put in motion.

We are told in the divine testimony that the doings of Israel were written for our ensample. Israel, a nation of two million souls, was assembled around Sinai—the pulpit of the Almighty—where he gave them the law which formulated their religion, and created them a church. There had been no church before this. There was no church in Abraham. From Eden to Sinai the world was churchless. All worship had been restricted to family lines. We now see the family lines enlarge until they swell into a single circumference, and all Israel, so far as worship is concerned, is melted into one family before the Lord. Families and tribes sink from sight, and the church in the wilderness stands a single organization, with one tabernacle, one high priest, one uniform and unchangeable order of worship and practice. If the Saviour built his house after the pattern of the sample shown in the Mount, he has one tabernacle, one high priest, one uniform and unchangeable order of worship and practice. But if the theory of the defense be correct, it is a righteous thing to break up the circumference line of this organization, and have a wilderness of lesser lines; to dissolve the solitary house, to wreck the real unified body, and let a house be built on Mount Gerizim, or any other mount, and bear

any other name; to let the objects of faith be altered or increased at pleasure, and the practices be changed by climate and observed according to individual caprice. The defense is manifestly wrong. God never intended for His house to be desolated by such confusion. His dealings with Israel, after this time, afford an incontrovertible ensample. That people were thrown into conflicts by the opinions of the rabbis growing into the dignity of law. They accepted doctrines that came from their great elders, and received traditions because they were venerable. A part of their tribes wandered from Palestine, and the remaining ones were divided in their worship, and split into sects. Rendered blind by their pride and the bitterness of their strifes, they knew not Christ when he came as the fulfillment of their law. Had they been living in the law, they would have known Him, and a united Israel would have speedily converted the world. But instead they were a divided house, with a disregarded law; and a world with a ransom was prostrate under sin. The indignant wrath of Almighty God was stirred against Israel, and for these eighteen hundred years she has been kingless and priestless; she has been a wanderer, with every man's hand raised against her, and finding no rest for her weary feet. Her presence to-day in every commercial center of the earth, persecuted, but "going on forever," forever expiring but never dead, is a living monument to the integrity of God. Men may, while professing to be His children, divide His house, and disregard His law, but His judgments shall not fail. On every public square you meet Israel with that curl of the hair and print of features stamped upon Abraham and Moses. Jehovah says, "My house is divided and my laws altered, but these wanderers shall be changeless forever." If this be true of the type, how much sorer shall be the punishment visited on those who distract the real house.

The interest of the kingdom of heaven in humanity is more universal and permanent than the interest of any earthly government can be; so the testimony offered by the records of the New Testament upon the establishment of its church or house of salvation is of primary value. Whatever it testifies was then done, must be accepted as the revealed purpose of Divinity. A law inaugurated, a commandment given, an ordinance established, an example recorded, or a suggestion offered, are all and severally to be viewed as revelations of the divine mind on human redemption. We accept and live by them, or reject and die from them. When God gives a commandment or form, it is to be obeyed. No substitution will answer. The thing given is what the Father intended. To say that it is not clothed with an imperial negative, a "thou shalt not do otherwise," is trifling with the eternal character. Whatever is given has the royal stamp upon it. That, that alone, that in its entirety, must be obeyed. A deviation from that precise thing is disobedience and heresy.

Cain and Abel were commanded to bring a sacrifice from the flocks. Abel brought a sacrifice from the flocks, Cain brought one from the produce of his fields. And we read that God had respect unto Abel and his sacrifice, but had not respect unto Cain and his sacrifice. Cain, enraged, persecuted his brother who had given a simple and exact obedience. Ever since, the descendants of Cain have been persecuting their brethren who persist in a simple and exact obedience. It won't do to say, "If the heart is all right, all is right," for God here, in the morning of his dealings with men, put his brand on this heart business, and refused to accept the professions of a heart when he had required the sacrifice of a lamb. The primary motives of Christianity were involved here, for the Apostle testifies that, "by faith Abel offered a more acceptable sacrifice than Cain." The fundamental prerequisite to obedience was lacking in Cain. Our piety, prayers, and heart are not the standard, if faith is in rebellion. Faith accepts all and obeys all.

Now, in the establishment of Christ's kingdom, we recognize Him as its sole founder and deathless lawgiver. Just prior to his ascension the Saviour said to his apostles, "All authority in heaven and earth is given into my hands. I will send you the Spirit. He will lead you into all truth. Go preach the gospel to every creature, make disciples of all men, teach them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you. Lo! I am with you alway, even to the end of the world." Edwards testified that this commission from Jesus was the sole authority of the apostles to act in the new empire or church. We are all agreed upon this. On the day of Pentecost the Spirit came. The apostles proclaim the gospel. Yet not they, but the Spirit that was in them. The Spirit used the apostles as instruments through which it addressed the people. Those utterances came to the hearers clothed with an awful majesty. It was a voice from heaven uttering words whereby men might be saved. Three thousand souls were that day added unto them, entered the kingdom, joined the church. The next day five thousand more came in. Shortly churches were established in Ephesus, Corinth, Crete, Rome, and before the last apostle's death the gospel had been offered to every civilized people. The apostles never made a change in their preaching. What they preached on Pentecost was preached everywhere they went. They could not have varied it had they so desired. It was freighted with the destiny of human souls. God's spirit had come to protect its unvarying form. From Peter, at Jerusalem, to the last sermon of John, every apostolic action thereon was the same as the first, and unchangeable as the decrees of eternity. Whatever one inquiring sinner was told to do, every other one under a like state or condition was told to do. It was the ministration of the Spirit, which was the very act of God himself.

What does this divine standard say concerning the effect of the preached gospel upon mankind. It caused men to have faith in Jesus as the Christ of God, and to ask what they must do to be saved. They were told to repent—a repentance which in that day did not mean a wail of tears alone, but a complete revolution of character, a turning of the self entirely around, from walking from God to walking towards God; a converting that was potent and real. Then they were baptized into Christ. They were now in His body, which is the church, and were to begin the life of Christlikeness. To be a Christian, one had to reveal a faith in Christ, come to repentance, and be baptized. There is not a solitary case in the gospel where any soul is said to be saved where one of these is omitted; not one where more is required.

We asked Rev. Mr. Post, who made affidavit we were heretics, if he could give us an exception to this statement. He cited Lydia and her household! Mr. Post's memory is a shade peculiar, but we always had the documents by which he could refresh his mind, and he never failed in the end to clear the mists away and come out all right. After mature reflection and refreshment, he concluded Lydia did believe and was baptized. He then said he could n't cite any more cases off-hand.

We have begged the learned counsel to give us one case, anywhere from the day of Pentecost to the final amen of Revelation, where a soul was said to be saved without faith, and repentance, and baptism. With a persistency that mocked the expectations of every one of their followers in this audience, they failed to attempt such a showing. We besought them to show us in all that history where more than this was required to bring man into Christ. With a strange fidelity to their doctrine, they continued to assert we were heretics, yet steadfastly refused to show us the additional requirement. Even Dr. Smith, with all his resources, acquired and imaginative, was unable to construct an additional condition of salvation. Eleven preachers, representing different denominations. have united to sustain the defense. This court-room has been filled with the troubled hum of their consultations. Their theology had been attacked with a perilous affliction, it had been asked to square itself with the word of God. They have stirred up their well stored minds, they have thumbed the forgotten books in their brains, they have dragged the sea of their theological lore from shore to shore, and have come back empty-handed of any additional requirement to bring one into the kingdom of Christ other than we have shown. Baffled, they sit like sullen specters over some cherished ruins, while above their heads appear the maledictions of Jehovah's word, "If any man or an angel from heaven preach any other gospel than that which has been delivered you, let him be accursed."

The testimony of Christ is contained in his life as written by Matthew.

Mark, Luke, and John. He never taught a doctrine as the world to-day understands scholastic doctrine. His whole teaching had relation to himself. His conflict with the world was a personal one, it was not doctrinal. It was to have men accept Him. He proclaimed himself the subject of an universal faith, that all men ought to love Him, that all men ought to serve and obey Him. Search through the testimony of the apostles and evangelists: each of them was true to Christ and no more taught a doctrine. They were strangers to scholastic divinity. They preached that men must love Jesus, must have faith in Jesus, must serve and obey Jesus, and this would bring them to salvation. Love for Jesus, faith in Jesus, obedience to Jesus,—this saves; nothing else does. This is Christianity; nothing else is. This is orthodoxy.

A significant part of our divine testimony, and for which we will have important use later on, is that the members of the apostolic church were called disciples, Christians; that these names had direct bearing on the relation of the person to the Saviour. Also the organization was called the Church, the Church of Christ, the Church of God. And these names all referred to the divine relationship. The Church stood as one body around the cross, even as Israel was one body gathered about Sinai. Sects and divisions were unknown. The Church of Christ in Jerusalem, and in Rome, and throughout all Asia was one, without subterfuge or sophistry, explanation or argument, as certainly and as demonstrably one as a Masonic lodge here in Albion, and at Moscow, and under the shadow of the pyramids, is the one Masonic organization. The Church is His body.

With a singular recreancy to their trust, counsel have not attempted to show that the blessing of God rested on Israel when she became a babel of conflicting sects; nor have they sought to justify the multitude of denominations of to-day by citing us to precedents in the apostolic days. The divided sects of Christendom, with their human names, are passing out of this trial of what constitutes orthodoxy, without one word of defense even from their lawyers. The union of all believers in the one body, and the wearing of the one name alone, goes from here unchallenged. The sacredness of that single body and its divine name goes unviolated. The fact is a ruinous commentary on a "body" that calls itself the Methodist Protestant Church.

We have now ascertained the facts concerning the establishment of the primitive church; that the church is the body of which Christ is the head, and that He is not a head with many bodies; that the apostles preached Christ's gospel to sinners, and that they did not preach scholastic divinity to them; that they told sinners what they must believe and do to be saved, and that they never told them to believe in or obey certain formulated statements of theology to be saved; that in the matter of name they

designated this kingdom by its divine relationship, and in no other way; that they spoke of the members thereof by their divine relationship, and in no other way; that this primitive church received the inspired teaching of the apostles as their creed and discipline, their rule of faith and practice; that they never received anything in addition thereto, nor in interpretation thereof—it was this, nothing differing from this, and this alone, that governed them.

This inspired teaching of the apostles was transcribed and constitutes the New Testament Scriptures. To the Christian that apostolic transcription is true religion. No child of God ever questions its genuineness. It is not justice to say that it is a correct presentation of Christianity. It is the presentation of Christianity itself. It is Divinity speaking words whereby we may be saved. It is the divine standard. By it we shall be judged at the last day. According to it eternity will be ruled. It reigns over us now, and aside from it there is no authority in divine matters in all the dominions of time.

We present to you this heavenly standard of true Christianity. Now let us bring forward the material statements of our oral witnesses, and you shall decide how each faith and practice and doctrine, here declared under the solemn obligations of an oath to be a tenet of plaintiff's church, agrees with that confessed authority.

The first witness we, the plaintiff, called was J. H. Edwards. He was the offending person at Salem Chapel, having preached there for a year, and was continuing his services when the Protestant trustees closed the chapel doors against him. Mr. Edwards is pastor of the Christian Church at Ligonier, and President of the State Ministerial Association of Indiana. His examination was quite thorough by the defense, and full latitude was given, but our own examination was short, for it was kept within the limit of the question at issue—What constitutes orthodoxy? Little space is required to pronounce all the points of faith and practice in true Christianity. Those material things which the sinner must operate in coming to the church are very few in number, and without entangling complications. Leaving these to strike the sea of scholastic theology, we find a shoreless waste. You may discuss over it forever, and come back knowing no whit more of the elements which enters into salvation. Doctrinal divinity forms no necessary link between the sinner and his Saviour.

Among the first questions asked of this witness, Mr. Edwards, was regarding the plea of the Christian Church. Every church has a plea, or a distinctive feature. He answered that the "plea of the Church was for a union of all the disciples of Christ in one body, with the word of God as the basis of that union." When we see the ranks of God's professed people distracted by factional animosities, and desolated by conflicts about

doctrines, I think there can be no diviner plea than this one. Whatever else may be wrong, this is divinely right. If such a church is wrong in many things, the operation of its plea is so self-corrective it will early come to the right. This plea is a safe one. I regard with great admiration the distinctive plea of the Presbyterian Church—the sovereignty of God. I adore that plea of the Methodist Church—human responsibility. But of vaster import to a dying world, and of greater interest to struggling Zion, is this other plea for the "union of Christ's disciples into one body, with the word of God as the basis of that union." The Master himself prayed that all his followers might be one, that the world might believe. This plea goes forth freighted with the supplicating solicitude of the Redeemer for the times that have now fallen upon us.

Because the Christian Church has refused to adopt the formulated statements concerning the divine personages, you have heard it said that we denied the "divine persons." This has been asserted to be our position concerning the Saviour—that he was received in a practical Unitarian belief. To settle that matter at once and forever, I asked Mr. Edwards:

Q. State whether or not the Christian Church demands of its members, and those coming to its membership, a faith in Jesus Christ.

A. It does.

Q. State whether or not it demands a faith in Jesus Christ as a divine being.

A. It does It always demands a confession of faith in Him as the Son of God.

Q. Well, would or would not the Church accept one as a member who would refuse to make this confession of faith in Jesus Christ as the divine Son of God?

A. It would not.

Q. He would not be accepted as a member?

A. No, sir.

The faith of this Church in the divinity of Christ is here made a matter of oath. The witness states the position with a powerful emphasis; he says no one would be accepted as a member of this Church who would refuse to confess faith in Jesus as the divine Son of God. Standing on the solid rock beside the gate of the walled city of Cæsarea, Jesus said, "But whom say you that I am?" And Simon Peter answered, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God." And Jesus said, "On this rock [on this great truth] I will build my church, and the keys of this kingdom I will give into your hands." So, when the penitent knocks at the gate of Christ's kingdom, no entrance is given him unless he confess that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God. He is then on the Rock of Ages, and enters into a city that hath foundations. When we take up the very words of Peter and thus operate them in our practice, we are standing where the Saviour's blessing has been written for eighteen hundred years.

Mr. Edwards was asked if his Church had any authoritative book of faith and practice—one which its members were compelled to obey. He

said they had such a creed or authoritative book. He said it was "the Bible, the whole Bible, and *nothing* but the Bible." They proffer to their members no man-made creed, no articles of faith, no formulated statements, no deductions of divinity, no theological conclusions, no interpretations of the word; they give them the Bible, the whole Bible, and nothing but the Bible. They reverently believe that this inspired book is abundant "for doctrine, for reproof, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God *may be perfect* and *thoroughly furnished* unto all good works."

Here are three significant answers. They index the character of the Christian Church. Its plea among the churches is for all disciples to unite in one body, with the word of God as the basis of that union. It proclaims Christ the divine Son of God, and admits no one as a member who refuses to make such a confession. In its faith and practice and requirements it takes the Bible, the whole Bible, and nothing but the Bible. The first rebukes the divisions in Protestantism, and pleads to answer the Saviour's prayer by a Christian union. The second announces the divine and God-constructed foundation of the Church. The third places this Church along-side of the apostolic church, and taking up its book speaks where it spoke, and is silent where it was silent—a sharp reproof to current church practices. The first and last answers several this Church as a peculiar sect: no wonder it has been much spoken against. As the Saviour set his face against the Judaism of his day, so has this Church turned his voice against the sectarianism of this day. This people are not likely to be confounded with any other body. They are a separate people. They have a singular plea and strange and unusual practice. They have rehabilitated the old Zion, they have reproduced the old forms, they have restored the mother tongue of the divine family. An uncommon and separate body, it is arrayed at the bar of justice under charge of heresey; it never stops to deny the charge but assumes its falsity. It announces its position, proclaims its divine correctness, asserts the infidelities of its assailants, and states its plea for union and the Bible alone with such clearness and power that the fundamental disobedience and will-worship of the opposition stand forth self-evident. That first and last answer is a defiant challenge to all churches to come up and compare measures with the divine standard. They are the two boldest things that have been said to the world and the church in seventeen hundred years.

The next phase of the evidence we will introduce touches the greatest question that was ever propounded. Of all the problems that have troubled human thought, none have been greater than this one—"What shall a man do to be saved?" The time never was when good men did not consider it. I would rather be certain on that question than to possess all the wisdom of all the schools of divinity in the world. A fullness of learn-

ing along those high paths may grace a man for renown among his fellows; but on this other path, filled with a knowledge of salvation, he is graced for the presence of his God. A drowning man pays no care as to whether the boat coming to his rescue is propelled by the scientific oar-strokes of a Hanlan; he only asks that the rescue reach him before he goes down forever. No soul crushed and bleeding under the conviction of sin ever stops to discuss theology. A bankrupt soul has no interest in dogmatic divinity. He wants salvation to reach him before he goes down. The purpose of Christianity is to bring the rescue within the reach of the sinner. Something must be done to lift him out of his sins. If he is not made separate from sin, he dies forever. Faith in a doctrine can not produce this separation. The simplest reason perceives that it can not. The reception of a theory can not avail. A profession of formulated statements will not answer. But the separation must be made. It took the Father four thousand years, with all the wealth of inspiration, and the sacrifice of the Son, to prepare that power. God had but one thought during all that tiresome time, namely, to separate the people from their sins. This is the all of salvation. His name shall be called Jesus, for he shall save the people from their sins. When the orthodoxy of a church is involved, its answer to the sinner's question, "What must I do to be saved from my sins?" is the trenchant test of its fidelity to Christ. If a church give the inspired answer of the apostle here, it is not likely to go far wrong elsewhere. A church that so fully understands the gospel and the object of Christ's sacrifice, that it speaks to the penitent sinner the precise words that were uttered by the Holy Spirit to inquiring penitents, occupies the chief cornerstone of orthodoxy. It is in harmony with the eternal purpose which God purposed in Christ Jesus before the world was.

This new-born son of God must continue separate from sin. The church, to maintain its harmony with the eternal purpose, must direct this disciple to "continue steadfast in the apostles' doctrine, in the fellowship, in the breaking of bread, and in prayers." Then does that organization round out and complete its harmony with the gospel, and is in fact the Church of Christ.

That we might know the conditions of salvation presented to the sinner by this Church, Mr. Edwards was asked: "What does the Christian Church teach as the first necessary step on the part of the sinner, that he may obtain salvation?" To which Mr. Edwards answered: "That he have faith in God, and in Jesus Christ as the Son of God."

This revealed a ground where the defendant stands as well as ourselves. The witness was then asked:

Q. What does that Church next require as necessary?

A. It teaches, and therefore necessarily requires, that the sinner repent of his

sins—his former sins—and turn to live a life of holiness and virtue, according to the teachings of the Scriptures.

Let me give you the questions and answers as they appear in the evidence, as follows:

Q. What next does that Church require as necessary?

A. The sinner having believed in God and in Christ, and having repented of his sins, and turned to live a life of righteousness and virtue, the Church next requires that he confess Christ before men, for the reason that the Saviour has said, "Every one, therefore, who shall confess me before men, him will I confess before my Father which is in heaven. But whosoever shall deny me before men, him will I also deny before my Father which is in heaven." (Matt. x. 32, 33.)

Q. What next does that Church require?

A. It next requires that the sinner submit himself to the command which was given by the Saviour in the commission—the first half of the commission—"Make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit."

Q. What next does that Church require?

A. That he conform to the second half of the Saviour's commission—"Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you," thus living prayerful and pious lives, continuing that obedience until the close of life.

Q. After the sinner has had faith in Jesus Christ, and has repented of his sins, and has confessed Christ as the divine Son of God, and has been baptized, what is the teaching of that Church as to the effect of these things upon the condition of the sinner?

A. It teaches that he is then received into the fellowship of God, and becomes his child, and that, so far as the sins of his past life are concerned, they are remembered against him no more.

Q. That process makes him a Christian?

A. Yes, sir; and he ought to be received into the Church.

Do these answers agree with the practice of the apostles? There is no mistaking what they mean. They state the conditions the Church imposes upon the sinner coming to Christ. They agree with the apostles, or they do not agree with them. If they agree with the apostolic practice, they are right. If they do not so agree, they are wrong. Are they right, or are they wrong?

Mr. Edwards was then asked:

Q. Did the Saviour and the apostles ever require any other belief, and acts of obedience, as you term them, as prerequisites to membership in the Church, than faith in Christ, confession of Him, repentance of sin, and baptism?

And his answer was, "I know of none, sir."

Is it a fact, that there is any other? If there is, then we fall short of the divine requirement. We present no other terms to the sinner on his coming to Christ. We have never required more; we never accept less. To be wrong here would be a grievous heresy. An awful responsibility rests on the Church: that it give the conditions of divine acceptance with

all the certainty and clearness with which they were proclaimed by the apostles.

Mr. Post testified on this subject. Being pastor of defendant's church, his statements are valuable. An extract had been read from Mr. Campbell on this subject, and Mr. Post had pronounced it unsound. It was where Mr. Campbell had said that "neither praying, singing, etc., was the converting act;" and we asked, "Do you regard praying, and reading, and singing, as preliminary to coming to Christ?" Mr. Post answered, "Yes, sir."

We then inquired, "Will you tell us of any place where the apostles ever demanded praying, and reading, and singing, as preliminary to coming to Christ? Is it not a fact that these things were enjoined after one was baptized into Christ, and never required of any one outside of Christ's body?" He answered, "I think the Apostle Peter commanded them to repent." That answer was an unworthy avoidance of a direct question. Witness and ourselves are agreed on repentance. It was now necessary to push Mr. Post; and we said: "Did he not command them to repent, believe, and be baptized; and was that not alone their duty, if they believed in the New Testament?" And he answered, "Well, perhaps it was."

This veteran preacher throws an uncertainty around an act which is the most solemn passage in life, more solemn than death, and upon which God himself has spoken. It was necessary to drive this witness, if possible, to a positive answer. So we once more approached him: "Well, sir, is n't it so declared by the apostles? And as the counsel has asked whether or not it is orthodox, and you have answered, I will ask you for a single passage of the Bible wherein the statement is contradicted?" And he answered, "Perhaps I am at a loss to recall any passage."

When driven into straits, this man hesitated to swear untruthfully; but he refused to swear to the truth, and so he balanced his conscience on a "perhaps." Do you believe this witness? He knows whether there is any such a passage or not. If there had been one, do n't you think he would have cited it? That is what he is here for. When a man's sectarianism won't let him swear to the truth, his sectarianism has become a crime. There is no such passage.

The terms of pardon offered the sinner by the Christian Church are those presented by all the so-called orthodox churches. They may add much more in many instances, and that much more was offered as a doctrine in former years; but our presentation of the gospel has caused every one of these churches to modify their additions to the gospel, and to-day you can enter any one of these by complying with the gospel requirements which we preach. In support of this fact, we took defendant's Church itself, and he who had made affidavit against us. We asked Mr. Post: "If

a candidate expresses a belief in the personality and divinity of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, and believes in the atonement of Christ, and repents, would you admit him into the Church?" He answered that he would.

"Would you admit him without baptism; is not baptism one of the requisites of admission into your Church?" And he answered, "It is really a prerequisite to Christian duty."

When we asked, "Would you regard a church as orthodox, Mr. Post, that did not accept the rite of baptism, or would not administer it to the sinner?" he answered, "I don't think I would regard it as orthodox."

The defendant's church itself here asserts that it receives members on their divine faith, repentance, and baptism. Then they receive members just as we do. Even on the subject of baptism, concerning which so much has been said, the defendant's representative head here pronounces those who will not baptize as unorthodox. The acceptance of the divine terms of amnesty signals the sinner's pardon, and return to Christ. The reception of these terms places the coming one into a saved state, and obligates his life to a faithful compliance therewith. Exact compliance with the terms proclaimed is God's test of our fidelity. We bring the penitent into the Church on these terms. There is no passage in the gospel that requires more than we require. No case where the apostles inducted persons into the Church where they required less than we require. We give an exact compliance to the terms. Now, we have not only the evidence of the divine standard to the correctness of our position, but the prosecuting defense asserts that its own Church will receive members on these terms as we do! Since 1823, we have combated the Protestant world because it did not enforce an exact compliance with the gospel conditions of pardon. After sixty years, one denomination has forced us into the courts to prove our correctness; and that denomination, by its representative, we put on the stand, and under oath it becomes a witness that confirms and proves our practice.

Having established that our induction of members into the Church conforms to the apostolic practice, we will consider some of the things that naturally arise in such an investigation as this. The witnesses, Revs. Post and Smith, clung with tenacity to the doctrine of the Trinity. It was manifestly their consuming thought. If the formulated statements of the Trinity are to be received, then the impression they sought to convey concerning us is true. But the formulated statements of the Trinity are not correct, and they are not to be received. We may justly be filled with a grave apprehension of this doctrine; with a singular persistence it has sowed discord and desolation in the Church for fifteen hundred years. The

Council of Nice was called in A. D. 325, to settle the dispute between Arius and Alexander concerning the Trinity. The formulated statement was there originated. It was unknown in the Church until that time. Arius and his dissenters were expelled from the Church, and the ban of heresy placed on them. It was the first time the officers of the universal Church had cast their "construction" of Bible teaching into the mold of church authority. Of necessity it gathered about it other "constructions" which also became authority.

And thus it was that the first creed grew into existence. An unhallowed thing, it required an unhallowed power to carry it into effect; and with it the Church soon lost its simplicity of faith and practice, and crystallized into the Roman Catholic Church. The new created Church waged a persecution for its cardinal doctrine until 533, when Justinian declared John, Bishop of Rome, the sole and effectual corrector of all heresies, and ordered the armies of Rome to obey the Holy See. The Vandals, the Ostrogoths, and the Lombards, had for the most part espoused the Arian cause; and on the above authorities (Bower's History of the Popes, Vol. II, pp. 335, 336; Gibbon, Vol. V. pp. 127–158), Belisarius led the Roman army against the Vandals, and utterly plucked them up. In 539 the same fate befell the Ostrogoths. And in 568 the Lombards met a like disaster. Which is all in exact fulfillment of the seventh chapter of Daniel's prophecy as to what the Little Horn [the Catholic Church] would do regarding three provinces. That Church has never ceased its aggressive policy on this doctrine. When the Reformers came, they unfortunately brought this dogma along with them, and the war still wages. Messrs. Post and Smith manifested that they thought more of a man's acceptance of the Nicene statement of the Trinity than they did of his obeying the specific commands of Christ. That Nicene statement of 325 was written two hundred and fifty years too late. To believe in the Trinity is one thing, to accept the formulated theology thereon is quite another. One witness of ours said in answer, "Yes, the Church believes in the Trinity; for John says, 'There are three who bear record in heaven, the Father, Son, and the Holy Spirit; and these three are one.'" He was then asked "if the Church believed and preached this statement, 'God the Father,'" and answered "Yes. The Bible continually uses the terms 'Father' and 'God' interchangeably."

Q. Do you teach this statement, God the Son?

A. Yes, sir; for John says, "In the beginning was the Word, the Word was with God, the Word was God." And the prophet says, "To us a child is born, to us a Son is given, his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, the Mighty God," etc.

Q. Do you teach this statement, God the Holy Ghost?

A. No, sir.

Q. Why?

A. Because there is no such statement in the Bible.

Q. But may it not be a proper construction from what is said in the word of God?

A. No, sir; by no means. No such construction should ever be placed, by the teachings of a church, upon anything in the Bible. Constructions upon the Bible—being wise above that which is written—have desolated the Church these fifteen hundred years. The Bible contains what the apostles and divinely inspired writers said upon these points; it is our duty, when we speak as a church of God, to speak their speech. This is right procedure; it can not be wrong.

After Mr. George W. Chapman had said that he believed in the Trinity, counsel asked him if he believed in three Gods; to which answer was made: "I do not want to be understood to say that there are three Gods. I want to be understood to say that there are three distinct intelligences united in one Godhead. Being thus united, as explained, there are three manifestations of the Divine Nature."

That is one of the best statements of the Godhead I ever heard. The testimony of Mr. Chapman is wonderfully pertinent to the issue. Nearly every one of his important answers is given in the very words of the Scriptures. They have the old Jerusalem ring about them.

The Bible has no precise expression on the Spirit's Godhead. The personal Godhead of the Holy Spirit as an object of worship was not announced until the latter part of the Fifth Century; and this announcement was at the city of Constantinople. The Holy Spirit is an intelligent Spirit. It is an entity, a person. It can see and hear, be grieved, vexed, and lied to; it can warn, constrain, comfort, and talk. We accept and believe every word said in the Scriptures concerning the Spirit, its personality, divinity, and Godhead.

Messrs. Post and Smith made the Trinity the very core of orthodoxy. They were lax on every other point; but their devotion to the Trinity amounted to a passion. We believe one ought to have correct views here; and if they are "the very pillar of orthodoxy," we can assert our position with great assurance. The testimony shows that we reject every view of the Trinity that does not come expressed in the very words of the Spirit itself. This is perfect fidelity to the divine standard.

Mr. Edwards was asked, "What is the teaching of your Church in reference to the operation of the Spirit in the conversion of the sinner?" His answer was, "The gospel is the power of God unto salvation." If there is any influence of the Spirit apart from the word, upon the sinner's heart, the Scriptures have nowhere recorded it. The defense believes that the sinner is enlightened, converted, and sanctified by the direct impact of the Spirit. This is a cardinal doctrine of Protestantism which we most positively deny. The defense failed to produce any evidence to support their theory. There is not a passage in the Bible that can be adduced to show any extraordinary and direct work of the Spirit on the sinner. The Spirit operates on the sinner only through the Word of Truth. Thus op-

erating, it is, indeed, the Spirit's work that converts and sanctifies mankind. Mr. Campbell uttered a great truth when he said, "I would not, sir, value at the price of a single mill the religion of any man, as respects the grand affair of eternal life, whose religion is not begun, carried on, and completed by the personal agency of the Holy Spirit." We believe that. We believe that this gospel, which the Spirit has presented us, is able to convince and convert the world. Hence we speak where the Bible speaks and are silent where it is silent. Again we present perfect fidelity to the divine standard.

There was some testimony from several of the witnesses, on total depravity, the freedom of the will, and the eternal decrees, but these need not engage our attention. Whatever attention they have won in the past has brought distraction to the house of God. There has been a great striving over these things, to no profit. Suppose the doctrine of depravity is true in all the fullness of its scholastic statement. Has the belief of it ever contributed to the salvation of a soul? Was belief in hereditary depravity required by the apostles as a condition of salvation? Was it prescribed in any of the letters as a grace with which the Christian must adorn himself? Does a knowledge of the doctrine tend to work righteousness in a man? We must successively answer, No! If this doctrine is not an operating force in the scheme of redemption, it is of no practical value. Grant the doctrine to be true, if these questions are answered in the negative, *there is no salvation in it.* If there is no salvation in it, it is not a proper question to be considered in the great issues of this trial.

These questions fairly test the value of any doctrine in theology. Let us present them to the "direct operation of the Spirit on the sinner's heart." Has the belief of this doctrine ever contributed to the salvation of a soul? Was a belief in the Spirit's direct operation on the sinner required by the apostles as a condition to salvation? Was it prescribed in any of the letters as a grace with which the Christian must adorn himself? Does a knowledge of the doctrine tend to work righteousness in a man? To each of these questions we must answer, No! This doctrine was never placed as an operating force in the scheme of redemption. There is no salvation in it.

Direct the same interrogatories to the "formulated statement of the Trinity." Has the belief of it ever contributed to the salvation of a soul? Was belief in the creedal statements of the Trinity required by the apostles as a condition of salvation? Was it prescribed in any of the letters as a grace with which the Christian must adorn himself? Does a knowledge of the doctrine tend to work righteousness in a man? And to each of these we must answer, No! Christ never placed this doctrine as an operating force in the scheme of redemption. Therefore there can be no salvation in it.

Mr. Edwards testified, and Mr. Carpenter corroborated him, that "on such doctrines as the Trinity, predestination, original sin, the decrees, etc., we are content to allow men to hold such opinion as seems good to them, without putting them under the ban of heterodoxy." On all these doctrines we leave the child of God to the same liberty Christ and the apostles extended him. No one of these doctrines is ever in the Scriptures, by command, practice, or implication, connected with the conversion of the sinner or a righteous life. Any church that makes the formulated statements of these doctrines a test of fellowship has usurped authority in the house of God, and has added to the things herein written. The Christian Church does not make a test of these doctrines, it does not recognize orthodoxy as connected with them, it does not place them at the church door and say, "You can not enter unless you bear them in with you." It says, "On these profound and intricate subjects have correct views; you had better avoid constructions and stick to the text, speaking your faith in these things in the exact words of the Scriptures." This is our practice. On all of these great dogmas we again present perfect fidelity to the divine standard.

Counsel was at a loss to understand how we determined the construction to be placed on any passage of the Scriptures. Mr. Carpenter replied to such a question that we settled differences as other churches. "When they arraign a man and try him, they do it by their standard, the creed—as David Swing by the Presbyterians, and Dr. Thomas by the Methodists; and when we arraign a man and try him, we do it by our creed, but that is the Bible itself."

Then it was asked, if the particular congregation where a difference arose was the ultimate judge in that case. He answered: "Well, as we have never had any such case (and we are not likely to have), any answer I might give would only be an anticipation of it; but, to give my own opinion, I presume, as we have the congregational form of church government, that it would fall to the congregation where the difference should arise to handle it, either by its own membership, or by other brethren whom it might select to do so."

Then came the question that was to produce a demonstration of the attorney's statement of the case, on the opening of the trial. He asserted that we were creedless, without helm or rudder in the religious world, and that our preachers taught all sorts of doctrine, and that we were destitute of any settled faith, or rules of interpretation. He contended that a church occupying our position would constantly be found in a wrangle of differences; that it was systemless and unorganized, and could never arrive at any uniform teaching or practice. With all the assurance of a lawyer that means to overwhelm a witness, the question was hurled at Mr.

Carpenter: "Do you know of any such thing as a serious difference in doctrine having arisen at any time?"

And to the confusion of the lawyer the answer was given: "No, sir; we have never been troubled in that direction, and we are not likely to be. We take the Bible as our rule of faith and practice, and let it do its own teaching; we have never been troubled, to my knowledge, about the question of doctrine so-called."

It was determined to risk another approach: "Do you mean to say that in your Church, there is no uniform opinion—that one may have his own opinion, no matter what it is?"

Now, the answer had no such meaning, for if we had had no serious differences, we had a pronounced uniformity of faith and practice, and presented to the world an unparalleled system in our organization. But let the witness answer: "No, sir. In matters essential to salvation there must be uniformity of opinion; in the things not necessary to salvation the widest latitude and freedom are granted; the whole thing hinges upon the relation these things sustain to salvation, whether they are necessary or not necessary thereto."

The entire line of questioning on biblical interpretation was conducted on the presumption that the primitive church did not present a perfect model, and that the experience of the ages had enabled men to improve on the revealed plan. The defense evidently believes it a necessity for church existence, that articles of doctrine be drawn from the Scriptures, and surrounded with a corresponding form of church organization. Hence they regard the divided condition of the religious household as a prudent and economic measure that brought order out of chaos, and a definite plan out of a confused generalization; that there must ever be broad differences in the constructions placed upon much of the divine teaching; that each of these paths of construction grows its own peculiar church practices; that this affords a house of refuge for every shape of doctrine, and the harmony of a government that has naturally grown up under it; that thus, the gospel, to be of practical value, necessitates religious denominations. This position is right or wrong. If right, we are wrong. If wrong, then the whole fabric of denominationalism is insecure, and must eventually fall.

It has been twice demonstrated to be wrong. For sixty years we have existed as a people; our preachers and members have been scattered everywhere preaching the gospel; they have gone forth without any creed or "constructed doctrine," but with the gospel alone. We are to-day the third most numerous religious body on our continent, and we have never had any serious difference of doctrine at any time. We have demonstrated their theory to be wrong. The primitive church was without a creed or

"constructed doctrine" for more than two hundred years. The apostles and early proclaimers bore to the world nothing but the gospel alone; false teachers came in, but they went out; it was the most harmonious, prosperous, and glorious era of the Church, and they never had any serious difference of doctrine at any time. The primitive church demonstrated this theory to be false. Can the defense present such a record. In the whole array of denominations is there one but what has been torn and rived by "serious differences"? And these factions have again warred and separated, until there are now more than five hundred denominations. Mr. Chapman uttered a truth when he said that the Scriptures were not susceptible of more interpretations than are put upon human creeds.

The primitive cause did not have its unity and prosperity distracted until men sought to enforce "constructed doctrine" upon the churches. Since that hour constructions have multiplied, and each new construction has brought a difference, and every difference has increased trouble in the house of God. Human creeds, composed of constructed doctrines, for the purpose of accommodating differing views, are pernicious in theory, and injurious to religion in practice. That part of the Bible that treats on the things necessary to salvation does not require a "construction." All the statements concerning the necessary matters in salvation are plain commandments of things to be done by the sinner. Personally, I feel that God would not be good in placing the words of eternal life in such a darkened way that interpretation of them would be necessary. If such be the fact, the apostle made a mistake when he spoke of the gospel as being God's revealed plan of salvation. Neither do I feel that He is all-wise, if a "construction" be required upon these essentials of salvation; because experience has shown that finite men have differed in the construction to be placed upon these things, and by the conflicts growing out of these different constructions the Church has been desolated for fifteen centuries. On the matter of human depravity, the direct operation of the Spirit, the eternal decrees, the freedom of the will, and the whole array of intricate and profound theological problems, known as scholastic divinity, the Bible has not given a formulated statement, nor required a specific faith. The members of the primitive church, doubtless, differed upon these great questions. As they have no necessary connection with salvation, God has left us free to whatever opinion we may prefer. And all the statements concerning the necessary matters in salvation are plain commandments of things to be done by the sinner.

You, no doubt, were much interested in the testimony on baptism. We rejoice that you had the privilege of hearing our position upon this subject stated from the witness stand, and supported by all the solemnity of a judicial oath. I am glad we got into court, so our standing on this question

may be established by operation of law. For more than half a century, every bigot that has assailed us, every unchristian feeling that has been aroused, every charge of heterodoxy, every prejudice agitated, every slander propagated, every malign influence exerted against us has been along the line of the baptismal lie. Here, now, in this evidence, you have seen what our teaching and practice is, and its conformity to the divine plan passes unquestioned.

Witness Carpenter was asked: "Does the Church believe the teaching that immersion alone, immersion without faith, without repentance, without confession, avails anything to the salvation of the soul?"

Did the witness hesitate? Did he halt and explain? His answer forever settles whatever doubt you may have had on this question. His answer was: "No, sir; the Church believes and teaches that such a baptism would be blasphemy before God." And the Church everywhere lifts its voice and adds to that answer its indignant emphasis.

The witness was then asked about the necessity of baptism. He answered: "It becomes necessary because it is one of the commandments of the Lord Jesus Christ; but the efficacy to save from sin is in the blood of Christ, which is appropriated and applied to the conscience by obedience to His commands."

The witness read from Mr. Campbell's debate with Mr. Rice, p. 555: "While we regard immersion, or Christian baptism, as a wise, benevolent, and useful institution, we neither disparage nor underrate a new heart, repentance, or faith; nay, we teach with clearness and definiteness that, unpreceded by faith and repentance, it is of no value whatsoever." And again, on p. 678, he says: "You may have heard me say here (and the whole country may have read it many a time), that a seven-fold immersion in the river Jordan, or any other water, *without a previous change of heart, will avail nothing*, without a genuine faith and repentance. Nor would the most strict conformity to all the forms and usages of the most perfect church order; the most exact observance of all the ordinances, without personal faith, and moral righteousness—without a new heart, hallowed lips, and a holy life, profit any man in reference to eternal salvation."

Mr. Campbell believed this and taught it all his life. Mr. Carpenter believes it; and teaches it, as an evangelist in Indiana. Mr. Edwards believes it; and teaches it, as a preacher. The preachers of the Church everywhere believe and teach it. There is not a member of the Christian Church anywhere but believes it with his whole heart, and teaches it with all his zeal.

When Mr. Carpenter retired from the stand, we rested. We had introduced Messrs. Edwards, Chapman, Owen, and Carpenter. Their evidence was clear, direct, and convincing. They were questioned upon

every shade of religious belief and practice, and each question received a straightforward answer; not one was avoided, not one. The testimony of Edwards, Chapman, and Owen harmonized as perfectly as ever did three witnesses in a court-room. Mr. Carpenter, who did not arrive at the trial until we had despaired of his coming—we having virtually closed our case, and the defense was preparing to call their witnesses; who did not hear a word of the evidence; who went on to the stand almost as soon as he entered the room; who was put through a thorough direct examination; who submitted to a three hours' cross-examination, most searching in its character, and forceful in its manner, in which an effort was made to create a conflict in the testimony, or secure the abandonment of a position that had been taken—this man, I say, who had left his sick-bed, and had come here in the integrity of his Christian devotion; who stepped from the cars to the witness-box; who swore that he was acquainted with the Church in every county in the State, as its State Evangelist for these twelve years; who spoke knowing its universally established faith and practice, did not conflict with a witness that had gone before him; he testified to the faith they had uttered, to the practices they had described, to the principles they had enunciated; he corroborated and emphasized every answer they gave; he did not differ from a single one, he reaffirmed every one—every one.

The Rev. Mr. Post attended as the prosecuting witness for the defense. He is the pastor of Salem Chapel Protestant Church, and wrote with his own hand the notice which forbid Mr. Edwards the use of that pulpit, and closed the doors of their house against the Christian congregation. We put Mr. Post on the stand as our witness. No wonder the defense exclaimed, "What does this mean?" We had levied a conscript from their own ranks. He sought to avoid answering many of our direct questions, but we enforced a definite yes or no from him, and when he finally left the stand he had testified to the correctness of our position, and announced our faith and practices, one by one, to be in harmony with the divine teaching. We were prepared to rest when we did, and permit the defense to call their witnesses.

They swore a dozen witnesses, the majority of them ministers in various churches. The first witness they called was the Rev. Dr. John W. Smith. He is a man of considerable ability, and evidently a theologian. He testified that one must have a correct opinion on all the things taught in the Bible, and that this correct opinion is necessary to make us wise unto salvation. But how shall one know that he has a "*correct opinion* on all the things taught in the Bible"? An opinion occupies a position somewhere this side of knowledge. It is always more or less speculative. One man's opinion is about as good as another's, for at the best it has no

assurance of certainty. An opinion may be correct, or it may not be correct. No man can verify his opinion on scholastic theology. He may be certain in his opinion, that his opinion is correct; but this is his nearest approach to a certainty. It is confidence in his own convictions. School theology is dogmatic, and it will require the daylight of eternity to make *certain* any of its opinions. Does not the witness give too broad a definition of theology when he says it "must be a correct opinion on all the things taught in the Bible"? Is not his theology at fault when he says this correct opinion is necessary to salvation? John Calvin was a theologian of some ability; from the evidence it appears that John Calvin and John Smith do not have the same "opinion on all things taught in the Bible." One is wrong. There may be a fair chance for both of them to be wrong. Mr. Smith's definition of orthodoxy breaks down with its vastness. Would not the witness have been nearer right if he had said: "Opinions have no necessary connection with orthodoxy"?

Every one should have right opinions, but a wise God has not suspended salvation upon their correctness. When the witness makes them necessary to salvation he has erected conditions of salvation unknown to the gospel. There is not a single proposition in the entire range of "opinions" upon which salvation is predicated in the Scriptures.

The defense did not attempt to have Mr. Smith testify on the gospel requirements in salvation. We had established that they were faith, repentance, confession, and baptism. When they passed without comment, and no evidence was offered on them, they are to be accepted by you as admitted by the defense. An effort now arose to make all people unorthodox who do not accept the popular statements of "theology." Mr. Smith said: "So far as the Christian Church differs from other denominations it is not orthodox." His standard of religion is that the majority makes a thing right. But I rather think Fred Douglas enunciated a better principle when he said: "God and one man on the side of the right is the majority of creation."

If the majority of the denominations make a faith or practice right, then all the reformers have been wrong; the Saviour was a heretic, and Luther was unsound. But majorities have nearly always been wrong, from Aaron and his golden calf, to the orthodox trial at Albion. There is no argument in a majority, except the argument of numbers. To accept a position as right because a majority of the churches hold it, is the plea of cowardice; to pronounce a church unorthodox because it differs from the other churches, is to overthrow the authority of God, and erect in its stead the opinions of men.

This witness was confined chiefly to discussing the direct operation of the Spirit, total depravity, and the kindred questions of theology. Upon

these points he said that as far as he had heard our teaching and preaching he did not think it was orthodox. He was able to name but one man he had ever heard preach in the Christian Church, and that was Benjamin Franklin. We wanted him to quicken his memory; still he could not name another preacher he had ever heard, nor a book from us that he had ever read. Well, if he had heard Franklin on the Trinity, did he deny the three personages in the Godhead? And he answered, "No; not in terms." Then we asked if he did in some other way, and his answer was, that "the sermon gave him the impression, that it impliedly said, the Spirit in its operations was a separate and distinct being." This aged minister, who heard a sermon many years ago, not one word of which he can reproduce, and from what he thought the speaker implied, comes into a court-room and swears that a great religious body of people are unorthodox and heretical. He was examined for an hour on thought, growing out of this answer, and steadfastly sought to convey his "impression" to the jury. It was Mr. Post who spoke of Mr. Campbell's recent work. Why, Mr. Campbell has been dead for nearly twenty years. The book to which he referred was written more than half a century ago. From books they had read, or sermons they had heard, these witnesses knew nothing, absolutely nothing of the teachings of this Church. They spoke only from "impressions" and "understandings." And yet on this basis, where a prudent man hesitates to speak in the common affairs of life, they hold up their hands before God and solemnly swear we are heretical teachers. It is my conviction that these gentlemen, during this trial, have heard more of the gospel of Jesus Christ, and of the teachings of this Church, than they ever heard before.

We have no objections to urge against the views of Mr. Smith on the Spirit, the Trinity, or total depravity. I enjoyed his discussions; they were marked with ability; he is a man of fixed views, and is a store-house of theological learning. When his opinions differ from ours, we are content to let him enjoy them, but when we differ from him he calls it heresy. Suppose, however, it should eventually prove true that we are "correct," then our friend will be glad that "opinions" do n't make for salvation. Grant that his explanations upon these doctrinal points are correct, he did not show where salvation had ever been ascribed to any one of them. He locates salvation with each one of them, but he failed to produce a passage of Scripture that agreed with him. He testified that it was necessary to a man's salvation that he have correct views on the Trinity. Yet Mr. Post testified that if a man believed and obeyed what the gospel commanded, he would be saved. Mr. Smith made a disastrous failure in attempting to show where the gospel demanded faith in any formulated statement of the Trinity.

His evidence was an argument on the necessity of faith in scholastic divinity. The defense appears to have accepted the requirements for salvation that we advanced, and now massed their efforts to establish "divinity" as also necessary. It is not needful to further pursue that undertaking in the discussion on the things necessary to salvation. We have shown the impotence of the effort, and its utter untenableness in the word of God.

There was one thing we wanted this witness to say; we desired him to state that the things which the apostles told the people to believe and do in order to remission of past sins, and also afterwards told them if they kept these things in memory, and added to their lives the Christian graces, they would be saved—we wanted him to say this was true. We did want him to say that. In the war of questioning that ran for an hour on this point, his genius for evasion was put to a remarkable strain, but we were unable to obtain an unqualified answer. Each answer was given with an annex of explanations. And this venerable leader of the sacerdotal forces that rallied to the standard of the defense, after nine hours of cross-examination retired from the stand, refusing to indorse the apostles on the essentials to salvation, without adding a proviso thereto.

During this examination various extracts were read from the debates and writings of Mr. Campbell, and from the creeds of many of the churches, upon doctrinal divinity. Our witnesses also testified quite fully upon these points. The fact was disclosed that there was no universal harmony of opinion among the churches, and that they differed from each other quite as much as they differed from us. Even the witness who possesses a high esteem for the denominations, in an unguarded hour, took them up, and successively swore them all into heterodoxy. It was after the defense had read a long line of quotations from our writers, and witness pronounced them unsound, that we reread a part and he emphasized their unsoundness; when, without notification, we read a passage from the Augsburg Confession of Faith, and its was promptly pronounced "not sound doctrine." In a little time the Baptist Church, after the same manner, was consigned to the same fate. Then we took up the Westminster Confession of Faith, and read from it, and he declared that unsound; so the Presbyterian Church was not orthodox. Then followed a number of extracts from Mr. Campbell on baptism. Witness now felt himself on safe ground once more, for the heresy of this was evident; but once more, without notification, we changed books, and read from John Wesley's Doctrinal Tracts, published by the authority of the Methodist Church. We read from Article XII., on baptism, where the author says, "It is the act by which we enter the body of Christ. For the Saviour says, 'except a man is born of water and the Spirit he can not enter the kingdom of

heaven,'" and asked the witness what he thought of that, and he answered, "unsound doctrine." We then read where Wesley says, "baptism and regeneration are synonymous, and that our Church has always believed and taught this." When asked if this was unsound, the answer was, that "it was unsound and heretical." Once more we turned to the Tracts, and read that, anciently circumcision was the act of entering into covenant relation with God, and as baptism stood in the room of circumcision, it was the act by which we now entered into covenant relation with God. And the witness pronounced that unorthodox and unsound, whereupon we lifted up the book where he could see it, and told him we had been reading from Wesley's Doctrinal Tracts!

An occasional avoidance of a direct answer may be overlooked in a trial, and an inability to do full justice to an opponent may be expected, but an evident purpose to impeach the integrity of a great religious people should be characterized in proper terms. This witness refused to accept the ordinary understanding of the plainest statement made by a member of the Christian Church, saying he "did not know what interpretation they might give it." The masterly statement of Mr. Campbell on the Spirit's work in redemption, he would not receive without adding his understanding of Campbell's position. A lucid statement on depravity, he said was good as it stood, but before he would pronounce upon it he would have to know "how it was interpreted." Emphatic declarations on the trusting faith and penitence that goes before baptism, he would not accept, insisting that the words "could be given another meaning." We read several simple and commonplace utterances on the general features of Christianity, which are written alike by all people, but he refused to give them recognition unless he knew how they were "understood" by the church that taught them. In all of these answers, it was sought to leave the impression on the jury that our published utterances did not represent us; that we formulated statements approaching near to the other churches, but within the church we had a different interpretation of them! The religious world may sometimes pronounce us unorthodox; but cowards, never. The forty years' ministry of this gentleman has many times witnessed the bold proclamation of our plea, and grieved at its triumphant establishment. Our life has been an open book.

When this witness could do no more, he sought to assail the integrity of the Church by implication. He is older than the reformation. He saw its feeble beginnings. He heard it charged with heresy. He has known men and women banished from home and society for espousing its teachings. He beheld it in disgrace, powerless, and everywhere spoken against. But he has lived. He has seen that Church become the third most numerous religious body on the continent. He has seen men and women honored

at home and in society for espousing its teachings. He has seen it become famous, powerful, and everywhere respected. He has seen its literature and colleges move among the front ranks. He has seen it a church where the poor had the gospel preached unto them, and where princes came to worship. He has seen the philosopher of infidelity march up against religion until faith trembled, and there was no hand to defend; but Campbell came forth, and Robert Owen and atheistic philosophy were forever driven back. He has seen Catholicism vaunt herself, and there was none to accept her challenge; but Campbell came, overthrew her Archbishop, and stayed the threatening tide. He has seen Ingersoll, in rampant blasphemy, travel the land, and the replying sermons of the preachers attract only a local notice; but we send forth Judge Jeremiah Black, who meets him in the greatest of the magazines, where they have the world's civilization for an audience, and universal reason rejoices in the triumph of faith. He has seen the country turn wearily from the seekers after her place and power, and ask for a leader whose life was true and whose heart was pure; and he has seen this Church give James A. Garfield, and beheld him confessed the completest representative of American life ever in the Presidency; when he lay smitten and stricken, the nation knelt at his bedside in prayer; he went down unto his death with his plume unsullied and his faith unshaken; the heart of the world followed his cortege, and wept its sympathy at his grave. He has seen the charged heresy of this Church in a court of justice established as the gospel of God! Notwithstanding all this, his ripe age, and holy calling, he filled his evidence concerning our advocacy and practice with a spirit that is unjust, and a doubt that is malicious. But why pursue this testimony longer? Let Mr. Smith, with his shattered veracity, be conveyed to a final resting-place. Let it be in the shade of some secluded retreat. Let it be where the splendid tread of this gospel plea, as it fills the world, can not disturb his repose. If possible, let his grave be so deep that Gabriel can not awake him. It would be unkind to resurrect him, for in eternity he would be a man without a country.

At the conclusion of Mr. Smith's testimony, the defense decided not to pursue their evidence further, and dismissed their remaining witnesses unused.

The learned counsel and Mr. Carpenter had a serious war in agreeing on the time when the Church of Christ was established. The lawyer wanted to give the Church the same origin as the denominational bodies. If witness had consented to that, he would have yielded a principle, and cast us on to a common footing with the sects. But the integrity of our plea repudiates a human origin. No man, as such, ever organized this Church. We do not claim to be a branch of Christ's Church. We are the Church itself. His Church has no branch churches. The individual members are the branches; for the Saviour, speaking to his disciples, said, "I

am the vine, and ye are the branches." If you give us a denominational creation, I will grant that we are not orthodox in that particular. This whole doctrine of branch churches is subversive of the unity and perfection of the body which the divine Master established on the earth. And a church, to be the Christian Church indeed, must be identical in all the essential particulars with that primitive establishment — it must have the same ceremony of initiation, the same constitution and by-laws to govern it, the same doctrine to continue steadfast in, and the same name. Any deviation from this is wrong. It matters not whether that deviation is the leaving off of very much, as the Universalists and Unitarians, or the adding on, and also the leaving off of much, as the orthodox churches.

Alexander Campbell did not start the Christian Church. "When was it organized?" counsel thundered, and the witness said, "About fifty days after the crucifixion of Christ, on the day of Pentecost." Counsel strove hard to compromise the witness. The audience listened with anxious interest, for here a fundamental principle was involved; and when the answer was given, that the Church was established about fifty days after the crucifixion, on the day of Pentecost, the murmur of applause that moved through the audience that filled the court-room, was evidence that fidelity to God was appreciated by this people. What Mr. Carpenter meant was, that the Church, which Christ established, was yet standing; that when he said to Peter, "On this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it," he uttered a truth. That that house stands yet, not a foundation stone removed, not a stanchion gone, not a pillar crumbled, not a light on its altar gone out; it stands intact to-day as when it was first erected, immovable and indestructible forever. Through all the rise and fall of heresies and faiths, that house has stood, with its form and its laws unchangeable. And in all these ages, whenever a penitent soul confessed its faith in Christ, and obeyed his gospel, it has entered into this church. Whether there were many or few, at a given place or time, it mattered not. Wherever one obeyed this gospel, even if he was the only one in all the world, he entered into this house of God. That is the meaning of the witness. When we, as a people, thus obey, we have not created a new church. When we have the same ceremony of initiation, the same constitution and by-laws to govern us, the same doctrine to continue steadfast in, and the same name, and nothing whatever added to or taken from the divine plan, we are the same church. This Christian Church, to which I belong, was established fifty days after the crucifixion, and on the day of Pentecost. Can defendant who assails us say that he has the same ceremonies of initiation, the same laws, the same doctrine and the same name, not having added anything thereto, or taken anything therefrom? We can! Here, again, we find ourselves in perfect fidelity to the divine model.

Viewing the "orthodox churches" in the light of the spirit that animated these when they were established, our position is unique and consummating. Looking at these churches as organizations that have crystallized, and propose to stay permanently where they are, we have no particular connection with them; but, viewed in the light of efforts to throw off the apostasy of Romanism, and to seek for the primitive faith and practice, we have a very intimate relation. There is a great common purpose in our battle, and the glorious object at which we aim, the restoration of primitive Christianity, is of infinite concern. Let us examine the Protestant bodies in their reformatory character. They were all a protest against Romanism. The protest created them. They were pro—test—ants. Men protested against what they conceived to be wrong in the mother church.

The primitive church had a clearly defined practice. We may enumerate, that Christ was preached, and never a doctrine as such; sinners obeyed from the heart, and gladly, whatever the apostles commanded them to do, and no service was accepted as obedience that differed from the exact divine requirement; this obedience was the vehicle that transported the sinner into the church; Christ's body was at a place, and the sinner, as to a domicile, must arise and go there, that he might enter in; those coming into Christ, Christians, continued steadfastly in the apostles' doctrine; they knew nothing else as doctrine. Now, this life of Christ, contained in Matthew, Mark, Luke and John—this preaching of Christ's gospel to sinners, and the practices connected therewith, contained in Acts of Apostles—the letters of instruction to those who had become Christians, contained in Romans, Corinthians, etc.—with Revelations, constitute the counsel and wisdom of God in the Church. Congregations established in Christ's body by this "royal law," were soon multiplied, enlarged and augmented throughout the civilized world.

When the Council of Nice organized a doctrine in the Trinity, which drove men from the church, and forbid others an entrance therein, a step was taken which departed from the clearly defined practice of the primitive church. These departing steps multiplied with increasing Councils, until the church stood forth robed in complete apostasy. It was now Romanism, and no longer *The Church*. Men sometimes wonder at the Dark Ages, and inquire the cause. There is no wonder here. When the light that lighteth every man that cometh into the world, is put out, darkness must ensue. In one sense, his light was yet in the world; "but if the light in thee be darkness, how great is that darkness!" In proportion as men retire from the divine likeness, in just that proportion do they retire from a prosperous dominion over the earth. When God created man in his image and likeness, he *gave* him dominion over the earth; and as man restores that marred likeness, he regains earthly dominion. Great and beneficial results

to humanity are not possible in heathen lands. Railroads, telegraphs, telephones, the application of steam and electricity, are not possible among the heathen. So among a continent of people, when the restored likeness is debased, advancement halts, and prosperity turns back on its axis. From Nice to Worms, the likeness largely restored was prostituted, and the world of growth was worse than standing still.

We locate the organization of the Roman Catholic Church in the Council of Nice. It was a new establishment in the religious world. Its Councils decreed its articles of faith, prescribed its practice, and defined heresy. The Bible was always theoretically upheld; but in the course of years a creed grew up, which was consulted by every inquirer, which was the standard in every appeal, and which controlled every movement of the church. The church was founded on the creed.

The important doctrines of Christianity were perverted in the most wretched manner, and such primitive purity as remained was obscured with extravagant opinions and idle fancies. The essence of religion was placed in the worship of images and departed saints. The fears of purgatory exceeded the apprehension of eternal torments. The latter they expected to avoid through the intercession of the saints, but none dared to hope for heaven without the pains of purgatory first. The people were not privileged to read the gospel; it was a sealed book, and given out only by priestly interpreters. A long series of reprobate practices and apostate faiths poured a current of calamitous events about the church, until Zion, on the beacon hill of the world, became black as sackcloth of hair, and the sweet waters from her fountain of salvation and peace had turned to wormwood and gall.

It was necessary that a reformation should come. God had said it would come. But for nearly twelve hundred years it did not come. It required more than a thousand years for the Church of Christ to reach the depths of complete apostasy. But having turned from the simplicity of the divine establishment, there was no halting-grounds until the depths were reached. Then a reaction began. One man alone could not produce a reformation. Reformations are not created single-handed, neither do they come forth in a day. They are an influence that moves forth unseen and unappreciated, an unformed sentiment, sweeping over a vast area of territory, and occupying much time, and finally converging at some center, and pouring into one man as through a funnel. He becomes the embodiment of the principle. It is personified in him. He is all afire with its integrity. He moves forth to its organization, and its consequent victory. So Luther became the incarnation of the faith and protest that had been growing in Germany for half a century. He flashed the sword of the Spirit before the dazed vision of the Pope, and at Augsburg organized the great return

to the old paths of the apostles. The Lutheran Church, founded on the Augsburg Confession of Faith, did not reach the old paths, but it went as far as one generation could march. What the world had been growing into for a thousand years, could not be outgrown in one generation.

Far be it from me to criticise this stalwart son of faith. He did the grandest work of any man of his time. His mission was single. No man ever has more. His work was to arrest the career of universal apostasy. He did it. He built his church on the Augsburg Confession, which was a protest against Romanism; but must needs leave the consummation of his holy purpose—the restoring of the simple primitive church—to the ages after him.

The spirit of protest moved in England, where Henry VIII. organized the revolt, and established the Church of England, the Episcopal Church. The king was moved against the Mother Church by his unrighteous desire to put away his wife and marry Anna Boleyn; but God may cause the wickedness of man to glorify His cause. Out of the baseness of Henry's adultery, England, with her vast influence, took up her march from Rome. The Church of England was founded on what we may term the Episcopalian creed. It did not pass over all creeds and councils, and take its stand on the ground its movement embodied. This was not possible, but England's coming made the Reformation a certainty.

Next came the Presbyterian Church. The spirit of reform was abroad in the world, and would not down. Bold spirits were hurrying in every direction, to find the Church from which the fathers had wandered. As men surrounded by a fog in an untraveled and dangerous valley, seek to escape and find safety, all alike interested, but each distrusting the other's way, and with a confidence in his own that was born only of necessity, so did scores of reformers toil, through this age, to rid themselves from the warp of judgment which twelve centuries of apostasy had thrown about the church, and come to know the truth as the early Christians knew it, and stand where they stood. In Geneva, John Calvin gave to the world his singular and wonderful doctrine of the Eternal Decrees. A hundred years after Luther they crystallized into the Westminster Confession of Faith, and gave us the Presbyterian Church. This Confession was not the story of the cross simply, as it was preached by Peter and John. It was a feeling through the fog, if haply they might find the house which they sought.

Out of this same spirit came the Baptist Church, and built itself on the Philadelphia Confession. In that they expressed what *they* believed to be the right road to the grounds of common interest. But the way was so beclouded they could not venture yet into the Bible alone, but must have a creed as a staff to guide and protect them. Religious thought was steadily

rising out of the valley. Men now needed but little of councils, conventions and creeds to help them. They were now beginning to see each other face to face. The Bible itself was begun to be read. It had become a sign-board, on which the hurriers by could read the way.

This same spirit brought forth the Methodist Church. John Wesley never intended to establish the Methodist Church. But the tendency of worldliness in the churches was paralyzing all that had been gained by the Reformation in other respects, and a path of real piety must be sought out. The methods employed by Wesley to infuse spiritual life into the people, were original and peculiar. In the course of time they assumed a system, and took on the machinery necessary to continue the movement. Out of this an organization grew, that ripened into the Methodist Church. It took on itself a name indicative of its peculiarity, method—ist, and consigned itself therto by establishing the Discipline, a creed conforming therewith, which was to control all its actions. The religious world had progressed so far into the light, that there was little need of longer resorting to experiments. There was small use for any discipline coined to assist a Christian. I have always thought that John Wesley ought to have protested against the hierarchy of the Church of England, and against all human appliances and church creeds, and with his devout nature and splendid powers, called believers to the simple word of God, and it alone. It must be that I am wrong, that the fullness of time had not yet come, and that the mission of this saintly man lay along the path of a restoration of personal piety. The world was not prepared for a restoration of piety when Luther came, or Henry, or Calvin; their movements gave that which the times required. But there was a hungering and thirsting after righteousness when Wesley came. He filled the want of the soul. God appears to have assigned one task to each of these reformers, even as he gave one task to Moses and another to Joshua. Wesley was a glorious herald—an unconscious John the Baptist, setting in order the last work for the restored kingdom.

The spirit that had worked among men for three hundred years brought forth the movement in which we are engaged, and realized the prophecy of Worms. Mr. Campbell was the leader of the special movement now known as the Current Reformation. He did not seek a new church, and earnestly protested against the formation of another sect. No sect was created, no church was organized. But a religious body was presented to the world, whose existence was not a purposed protest against Romanism. It had moved from a protest to an affirmative plea. It was not founded on a creed. Its faith was not defined by formulatad articles, and the edicts of Councils did not give it shape. It rested on the word of God. It rested on the word of God only. Every practice which the primitive church practiced, it put into practice; every person or doctrine

which the primitive church required a faith in, it required a faith in. Whatever practice the primitive church did not operate, or faith not required, it made no movement in. It stood where the primitive church stood. The grand march began at Augsburg, and extending over three hundred years of toil and struggle, reached its blessed consummation when a handful of Disciples, weary with the way and bruised in the conflict, cast themselves on to the word of God alone. Up out of the valley, the "Old Paths" had been reached.

Primitive Christianity was restored. God had built the house, and it was appointed with every appliance to move its vast interests in His service. Having reached the coveted ground, it only remained to operate the divine appliances, to make good the blood of the martyrs and the labor of the reformers. Has it been done? Have we only reached the goal to which the Lord's people started, or have we carried consummation to a fruition, and entered into the practices of the Israel of God?

This Church preaches the gospel to sinners as the power of God unto salvation, and never a doctrine as such. Is this heterodox? It is what the primitive church did; therefore it is apostolic. This Church teaches the sinner to have faith in Christ, repent of his sins, confess his Saviour, and be baptized into the name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, and he thereby becomes a child of God. Is this heterodox? It is what the primitive church did; therefore it is apostolic. It never requires faith in any formulated statements of doctrinal divinity, leaving each person free to his own honest convictions thereon. Is this heterodox? It is what the primitive church did; therefore it is apostolic. This Church teaches those in Christ to add the Christian graces, and continue in the apostles' teaching. Is this heterodox? It is what the primitive church did; therefore it is apostolic. This Church calls itself by the name of Christ, by the divine names, and rejects all other names. Is this heterodox? It is what the primitive church did; therefore it is apostolic. This church excludes all confessions, disciplines and creeds, and takes the word of God alone as its rule and guide. Is this heterodox? It is what the primitive church did; therfore it is apostolic. This Church practices or excludes, respectively, everything here enumerated. Mr. Edwards, Mr. Chapman, Mr. Carpenter, swore that we did so, and Rev. Mr. Post testified that this would make a man a child of God, and save his soul. This is not heretodox, for it is what the primitive church did, and is therefore apostolic.

The testimony of the witnesses reveals this Church as holding the exact faith of the early church, and using every form of its practice. It reveals that nothing is omitted that the early church operated, and not a name, or a ceremony, or a creed, or anything whatever, has been added thereto. It does as that church did. This is Christianity restored.

The Reformers labored to bring the Church back to God. They spent their lives in this work, and each one moved the great march a lifetime's journey nearer home. Calvin could not have done his work in the days of Luther. No one of these men could have come at the time of the other. Their movements followed each other in a necessary sequence. Luther tore down Papal assumptions, and restored private judgment in divine things. Calvin came, and restored God's sovereignty in the church. Wesley came, and established human responsibility—that every man must obey God for himself. But neither of these great principles, operated alone, could restore the church. Campbell came, and harmonized them, where their extreme doctrines were conflicting with each other, and revealed their perfect accord in the gospel of Christ, and thus made possible the union of all Christians on the word of God. His was the consummating work—the organization of their materials. Out of them he brought a distinctive and perfect plea. For more than a thousand years the church had traveled down into apostasy; these reformers, with their co-workers, moved a return. They marched on for three hundred years, following each other in a necessary and divinely appointed order. Such an embattled host earth never saw before. Not like the baffled and beaten crusaders, as they filed across the plains of Palestine, forsaking their defeated hopes, and fleeing to their European homes; it was rather the resolute sons of God, forsaking the crimes of Rome, while their mighty phalanx, earth-wide in its advancing influence, moved on with each new generation, in increasing faith and hope, to the sepulchre and Zion of their Saviour.

Since Nice, the church has wandered far from the divine standard, each party seeking to erect a standard of its own. The Rev. Mr. Smith, in his testimony, still clings to one of these standards, and seeks to measure us thereby; but the evidence has revealed the divine standard, and shown the so-called orthodox text of Mr. Smith to be of no value. It does not measure or touch the eternal concern of the soul, and its struggle in the redemptive scheme. The true standard and its features have been made to stand out as clear as the sun. Our position has been placed it in "that fierce light that beats against the throne"—a legal investigation—and found to fill it with a divine perfection.

Our position, with reference to the Reformers, is unique and consummating. The defense has arraigned us here under charge of heterodoxy, but the evidence adduced establishes us as reproducing the church of the New Testament. That makes sure our orthodoxy. It demonstrates that we are the fulfilment of all that was prophesied in the work of the Reformers; but the action of the defense says that they have stopped short of realizing the restoration of the early church, and on the wayside have built their temple. The defense that prosecntes us here must not have halted in

the great march to God, and built on Gerizim their permanent home. Unless then now move on, "sin lieth at the door."

Much time was spent in the testimony in ascertaining the circumstances surrounding the organization of this church, and learning its relation to the various denominations; but it was time well spent. As these facts of history pass in review before defendant's church, they will be confessed, and our position in this historic march will challenge their Christian integrity for recognition. We have examinad the salient features of the evidence, on the things believed, and the practices observed, by the Church on trial. A few clearly established points we may mention:

1. We accept the Holy Scriptures as inspired of God.

2. The New Testament Scriptures contain the law of the Lord on the matter of salvation.

3. Jesus was God manifest in the flesh. He was the Son of Mary and the Son of God. "The Word became flesh, and dwelt among us." "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the God, the living One." Jesus was divine as God is divine, and human as man is human.

4. We never preach a doctrine, as such, for the faith of the Church. We present the Christ alone as the object of faith. No other name (system, authority, or doctrine) is known in heaven or among men, whereby we may be saved.

5. The statements of Scripture concerning the Trinity and the operation of the Spirit are accepted in their complete and full meaning. No formulated statement of these is ever made, in addition to that which is written.

6. A living faith in the divine Saviour is the test of Christian fellowship. No mere doctrine is a test of *Christian* fellowship.

7. The sinner coming to Christ, must have faith in Him, repent of his sins, confess his faith in the Redeemer, and be baptized into the name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit. It is admitted that in every case of New Testament conversion nothing less than these steps was accepted; neither was anything more required. This, and simply this, was the apostolic practice.

8. On entering the Church, a righteous life must be lived. The Christian graces must be added to this growing, Christlike character.

9. If a Christian sin, he is not thereby cut off from the body of Christ, to enter again by his former steps of initiation, but is restored to divine favor by confession. "If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness." See John's first letter to Christians, 1st chapter, 9th verse.

10. The Church is known by the name of its divine relationship—The Church of God, The Church of Christ, and The Church. Or when

with reference to the character of those who compose it on the earth, Christ's ones, Christians, it is designated as the Christian Church.

11. This Church has no collated Articles of Faith and associate rules to control it. It stands on the one article of faith which Peter laid down, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God." Jesus said, "On this rock I will build my church."

12. The regulation of the daily life, the forms of worship, and the ordinances of the house, are those prescribed by Scripture. No rule of life, form of worship, or ordinance, has been added thereto. The belief and practice is, "that all Scripture given by inspiration is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may become perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works."

13. The church which the gospel of the apostles established is the *model* for all the ages. It was reared by divine direction, as was the tabernacle in the wilderness. The Scriptures, from Matthew to Revelation, are the plans and specifications thereof. They model the building, and the life of the occupant therein. "If any man, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel than that which is delivered you, let him be accursed."

14. In the article of faith on which the Church stands, the induction of the sinner into the Church, the refusal to put a construction on the essentials to salvation, but requiring the very thing to be done that is commanded, permitting freedom of opinion on all so-called doctrines, wearing the Name of divinity to the exclusion of all other names, rejecting any book or code of faith and practice except the word of God: in all these the Church conforms to the divine Model. Where the Bible speaks, we speak; and where the Bible is silent, we are silent.

15. The word of God is the standard of orthodoxy.

We have arrived at the close of an important chapter in religious history—the arraignment of a church before a legal tribunal, on the charge of heresy. In the trial, creeds and popular standards have been rejected, and an appeal taken to the word of the living God. In such an appeal, the truth is made evident, and error is overthrown. All the evidence has been given under the solemn sanction of a judicial oath. Four men have testified here, who have spent their lives in the service of this Church. The dignity of their testimony establishes their ability to speak on this grave issue. That which we gave our sacred assurance at the opening of the trial we would do, we have done. As the trial has progressed, each added hour of the evidence has served to clear away the misunderstandings and the erroneous conclusions concerning our church life, until it now stands before you, divine for its nearness to the Master's way, and precious for its confident trust in the great Father. We have

unfolded a church that takes God at his word; whose practice is, "Thy will, not mine, be done;" whose pathway is according to the footprints of his everlasting testimonies. We submit the evidence to your decision, with its eternal weight of interest.

S0-BVE-051